QUERIES
TO THE
Presbyterians
OF
SCOTLAND,

Whereunto a satisfactory Answer is humbly desired.

By a Gentleman of that Country.

Matth. xv. 9.
But in vain do they worship me, teaching for Doctrines the Commandments of Men.

EDINBURGH,
Printed by *J. Ross*, and *A. Davidson*, and are to be sold by *A. Davidson* at his Shop in the Parliament-house.

Scotland. — Churches, etc. —

Presbyterians.

THE PREFACE.

THE following Queries were ſent to me by the Author, to be publiſhed or not as I ſhould think proper, and upon peruſal of them, I was ſoon determined, and reſolved to make them Juris Publici; as, hoping that the Unprejudiced Readers, for whom they are deſigned may receive Benefit by them.

The Author acquaints me, That his reading lately Maſter Forreſter in St. Andrews Plea for Presbytry, occaſioned them, he being at that Time in a Country-Place, where Mr. Forreſter's Performance did take with ſome. He ſays, That he had few Books beſide him, but the Bible when he wrote them, and that he had ſcarcely Time enough after his Return to Edinburgh, to adjuſt the few Citations which are in it, before he got the Occaſion of printing them for the enſuing Aſſembly: He abſtains from all perſonal Reflections, or provoking Language, reckoning that beneath a ſerious Enquiry after Truth,

and an Evidence of a leſs Chriſtian Temper, tho' he tells me, That Mr. Forreſter *in his Book, is very* Abuſive, *and treats Men of eminent Learning, Merit and Candor with the laſt* Contempt, *Inſolencies and Reproaches, but he had no mind to repay them in the ſame Kind, by returning* Railing *for* Railing.

No Party of Men ſet up more for Scripture *Precepts, and practicque or divine Right, than the* Presbyterians *of* Scotland *do, for their ſingular Scheme of* Eccleſiaſtical Government; *or, deſpiſe more the Practice of the firſt and* pureſt *Ages of Chriſtianity than they, for no other Reaſon, but becauſe it is againſt them, as has often been demonſtrated by the learned Writers for* Epiſcopacy, *ſeeing then they* appeal to Scripture, *This Gentleman goes to* Scripture *with them, and puts himſelf upon that Iſſue; and I think they are obliged to give* Scripture Anſwers *to his pertinent* Queries, *otherways they ſhould not pretend to put the Stamp of* Divine Authority *on their* Novel Inventions, *which had no in place the* Church *of God, for near fifteen hundred Years after the firſt* Promulgation *of the Goſpel.*

I take it to be no hard Task to make it appear, That nothing is more groundleſs or extravagant than that Pretence *of theirs to* Parity *from* Scripture *among authoriz'd Office-bearers in the* Church *of God is, That there was a great* Diſparity *in the* Prieſthood, *which God was pleaſed to appoint under the* Law, *with reſpect to* Dignity, Power and Authority, *among the Miniſters under that Diſpenſation is ſo evident that the* Presbyterians *themſelves do not deny it:*

There

There were among God's peculiar People *then the* High Prieſt, *the* Prieſts *and* Levites. *So that the* Superiority *of one Prieſt over another can never be ſaid, in it ſelf, to be ſimply unlawful; And ought not to have hard Cenſures put upon it, ſeeing it was of God's appointment in his own Church.*

But our Adverſaries having no Footſteps for this Model of Government from the Old Teſtament, *I ſhall in the next place endeavour to prove, that the* Chriſtian Prieſthood, *or Miniſtry of Reconciliation was inſtituted by our* bleſſed Saviour *in ſo great a* diſparity *among the* Miniſters *of our moſt holy Religion, as it is utterly inconſiſtent with* Parity. *For firſt he appointed and commiſſionated* Twelve *whom he named* Apoſtles (*conform to the number of the* Tribes *of* Iſrael) *to preach the Goſpel of his Kingdom,* Luke 6. *and* 13. *Afterwards he appointed other* Seventy Diſciples, Luke 10. (*according to the number of the* Jewiſh Sanhedrim) *now unleſs the* ſeventy Diſciples *were equal to the* Twelve Apoſtles, *which is affirm'd by no Author that I know of, the inference is plain, that the* firſt Miniſters *whom* Chriſt *appointed, and who had their Commiſſion and Work ſet them from his own Mouth* were not equal, *or on the ſame level.*

Another Order of Eccleſiaſticks (*ſo I call them who had Authority to preach the Goſpel, and to adminiſter Baptiſm*) *are the* Deacons, *the* Apoſtles *ordained them by* Impoſition *of their Hands after the Number of the* Diſciples *were multiplied, and they are ſaid to be* Men full of the holy

holy Ghoſt, Acts 6. *This order of Men was to continue in the Chriſtian Church, ſeeing the* Apoſtle *has given* laſting Rules *concerning their Qualifications and* Converſation, Tim. 3. *and accordingly from that Time to this Day, they have always been an* Order *of Miniſters, in the Chriſtian Church. Whence I infer that the* firſt Miniſtry *which* Chriſt *appointed, and the* Apoſtles *after his Aſcenſion, who were veſted with a plenitude of Power, was not in* Parity *or* Equality, *but in very great* Diſparity *and* Unequality, *there being at that Time* many *Church-Officers of different Ranks, and the* Apoſtles *were undoubtedly* ſuperior, *both in* Power *and* Dignity *to all others, of what ever Degree or Denomination.*

St. Paul *tells us, That our bleſſed* Saviour, *upon his Exaltation, gave* Gifts *unto Men for perfecting of the Saints for the Work of the Miniſtry, for the edifying of the Body of* Chriſt, *that is his* Church; *Now were thoſe heavenly* Gifts *which Chriſt beſtowed from on high, for ſuch great Ends as the* Apoſtle *mentions, given to Men acting in* Parity *with an* Equality *of Power, and of the ſame Rank and Order, let any Body that can do it, reconcile ſuch an Aſſertion to* Epheſ. 4. 11. He gave ſome Apoſtles, ſome Prophets, and ſome Evangeliſts, *&c. But if this Text is not full enough (as I think it is) for a* diverſity *of Office bearers in* Chriſt's Church, *there is a parellel Text to it, where the* Apoſtle *ſets down the difference among them with a* Firſt, Secondarily *and* Thirdly, 1 *Cor*, 12. 28. And God hath ſet ſome in the Church, Firſt, Apoſtles,

Apoſtles, Secondarily Prophets, Thirdly Teachers, &c. *'Twould ſeem to me as if the* Apoſtle *had of purpoſe here, ſet himſelf to oppoſe and beat down that* Equality *among* Church-Officers *which has been* Idoliz'd *by ſome in the* latter Days. *For he adds* Verſe 29. are all Apoſtles? are all Prophets? &c. *and ſeeing nothing does better illuſtrate any Truth, than* appoſite Similitudes, *he makes Uſe of one, to enforce this, and Reaſons from the admirable Structure, and uſefulneſs of the Parts of the human Body, and their different Functions, and ſubſerviency to one another, and to the Safety and Preſervation of the whole, and that ſome are more, and ſome are leſs honourable, which he applys to the* myſtical Body *of* Chriſt, *and brings all Home to the Government and Miniſtry of the Church; We ſhall find this beautiful Order, which conſiſts in a well tempered* Superiority *and* Subordination *among the Miniſters, thro' the whole* New Teſtament; *The* Apoſtles, *to whom our Saviour ſaid,* As my Father hath ſent me, ſo ſend I you, *were* Superior *to all others, and by vertue of their full Powers, could perform all the Functions of the ſacred Miniſtry: And* Miniſters *of all other Ranks under them (who were taken* in partem ſolicitudinis *) were* appointed *and* limited *by them in the Exerciſe of their reſpective Offices, according to the Nature of the* Charis mata, *or Gifts, with which they were endued, and the Orders given by the* Apoſtles *their* Eccleſiaſtical Superiors; *And are called their* Fellow-labourers, Fellow-Soldiers, and Fellow-ſervants; *and* employed

by

by them as they saw Occasion. Thus Titus *is by Saint* Paul *left in* Crete, *to* ordain Elders, *that is* Presbyters, *and other subordinate Pastors*, in every City, *and to* govern the Church, *Titus* 1. 5. and *Timothy at* Ephesus *for the same Purpose*, 1 Tim. *Chap* 3. *Whence 'tis evident, that not only the* Apostles, *but also others under them, were* superior *to Presbyters; and not only had Power to confer sacred Orders, but likewise Authority to* censure *and* judge *Presbyters*: Against an Elder or Presbyter, *&c.* receive not an Accusation, but before Two or Three Witnesses, 1 *Tim.* 5. 19. *Here is Power to receive and reject* Accusations, *cite and examine* Witnesses, *and to inflict* Punishments, *according to the Quality or Degree of the Crime. I take this to be a good Argument against* Parity; *for it not only demonstrates the superior Power of the* Apostles, *who conferr'd this Episcopal Power upon* Timothy; *but 'tis as full for* Timothy *and* Titus *their Power over the* Presbyters *of* Ephesus *and* Crete, *who were made accountable to them.*

Once more; We often meet with Missions *and* Delegations *in the apostolical* Epistles, *which makes another Argument for*: superior *and* subordinate *Ecclesiasticks, from* Scripture; *for Example*, Tychicus *with* Onesimus *sent to the* Colossians, *Chap.* 4. *Ver.* 6, 7, 8. *and to the* Ephesians, *Chap.* 6. 21. &c. *Thus were* Urbanus, Clemens, Epaphras, Aristarchus, Demas *and* Luke *employed.*

Thus have I given a brief Account from the Scriptures, *of the* Ministry *which* God *and* Christ *appointed in the Church, under both Dispensations; from*

from which it is evident, that it consisted of different *Orders of authorized Persons, notoriously distinguish'd by* superior *and* subordinate *Offices and Officers, with respect to* Authority, Power *and* Dignity *in administring the Affairs of Religion. It is as easy to make Two* contradictory *Propositions true, as to reconcile* Parity *or an* Equality *among the Ministers of our Religion, to the* Institutions *of God and our Saviour, and to the Accounts which the* Scriptures *give us. Let the unprejudic'd Reader judge with what Face the* Presbyterians *can pretend* Scripture *for their belov'd* Parity; *or entitle their Books written in Defence of Presbytry,* Scripture Pleas?

'Tis true, *When the* Presbyterians *are hard put to it, they have* Distinctions *to perplex the Case, when they cannot deny what is alledged against them, and have no other Way to extricate themselves; and here comes in their Distinction of* ordinary *and* extraordinary *Offices. They will own, that there was a* Difference *among the* first Ministers *of the Gospel; but that,* say they, *died with themselves; and that the* lasting Ministry *of the Gospel belongs to mere* Presbyters, *acting in* Parity, *without any other Superiority or Subordination, either in Order or Degree, than the chooſing a* Moderator *at their Meeting. In* Answer *to this* Distinction, *I say,* First, *That what they affirm of the Gospel Ministry, with relation to Ministers acting in* Parity, *is* gratis dictum, *and a begging the Question.* 2dly, *Suppose for once, that Distinction to be good, it allows, That the Christian Church was at* first *founded, and govern'd, and the Faith propagated by Ministers of*

 diffe-

different Orders; *and in ſo far* excludes Parity *or* Presbytry. 3dly, *That* Diſtinction, *as to the Caſe in Hand, is* Futilous *and* Impertinent; *for what is* extraordinary *has Relation to ſome* antecedent *ſettled Order*; *Now, if there were at firſt a* ſettled Order of Men, *ſufficient for performing the Functions, and Miniſtries of the Chriſtian Religion, what need was there to appoint and employ thoſe* extraordinary Apoſtles, Prophets, and Evengeliſts, *for doing that Work, for which Proviſions had been made, by appointing the* ordinary Officers? *But if it be ſaid, That the* extraordinary Officers *were firſt appointed (which is ſtill very abſurd, becauſe extraordinary is the* Correlatum *to ordinary) What can we conceive wanting to the* extraordinary Officers *of the* Church, *to oblige them to have their recourſe to the* ordinary *and* ſole Order *of* Presbyters? *Certainly, if we conſider either the* Work *and* Buſineſs *of* Eccleſiaſtical Government, *or the* Original *of* Church Power, *or the* Chariſmata, *the Gifts and Qualifications, wherewith they were endowed, we ſhall be forced to acknowledge, that either they were* all ordinary, *or* all extraordinary. *Indeed in the* firſt *Days of the* Goſpel, *the* Gifts *of the* Holy Ghoſt *were pour'd forth ſo plentifully on all* Fleſh, *according to that* Propheſy *in* Joel, 2. *Chap.* 28, *and* 29 *Verſes, That* all ſorts of People *Old and Young, Men and Women, (tho' they had no Office in the Church, but were mere* Laicks) *had* extraordinary Gifts *beſtowed upon them as well as the* Apoſtles, *ſo that this* Diſtinction (*as*

the

the Presbyterians *make use of it against the* Succession *of* Ecclesiasticks *in that comely Order and regular Subordination, which our blessed* Saviour, *and his holy* Apostles *established in the Church*) *leaves us no Ranks of People in the Church: For* extraordinary Gifts, *which are now* ceas'd, *were then* common; *and by consequence, they* overthrow *the Christian Church.*

Now the making the different Orders *of Church Officers, which we find in the* New Testament, extraordinary, *leaves the Church, in after Ages,* no Pattern *from the* Scripture, *to imitate or conform it self to, in the Ministry and Government Ecclesiastical: For* extraordinary Examples are not Precedents, nor design'd for Imitation. *It is certain, that the same Work which the* Apostles, Evangelists, Teachers, *&c. did in their Days, was to be perform'd by* authoriz'd *Persons* to the End of the World; *They who came after the* Apostles, *had right to* Christ's *promised Presence, as well as the* Apostles; *And therefore the* Apostles *must necessarily be* succeeded *to, even in the* plenitude *of Power, as to the necessary, permanent, and perpetual* Authority *and* Jurisdiction, *over all subordinate Officers, and Believers in Christ: And that* Superiority *and* Subordination, *which is necessary among the Governours of any Society, and which is very remarkable throughout all the* Scripture *Accounts of the Church Government, must* continue, *unless People will prefer Schemes of their own Invention, to the Appointment of* Christ *and his* Apostles.

The Presbyterians *may go any where ſooner than to the* Bible *for* Precedents, *whether* ordinary, *or* extraordinary, *to prove that the Government of the Chriſtian Church ſhould be adminiſtred by mere* Presbyters *(in the modern Senſe of that word)* acting in Parity. *Yea, I think it will be hard for them to prove, that ever* God Almighty, *either* inſtituted, *or* approv'd *of any ſuch Government in any particular Church or State, as is Adminiſtred by Men acting in* Parity.

Seeing, from what has been ſaid, nothing is more certain than that Chriſt Jeſus *appointed* different Orders *of Miniſters, for* founding Churches, *and propogating his moſt Holy Religion, and aſſiſted them with divers* Gifts *of the* Holy Ghoſt: *And the* Churches, *ſo far as the* New Teſtament *gives Account of them, were govern'd by ſuch as had* Power *and* Authority *over ſubordinate Miniſters*: Why may not the Church be ſtill governed after the ſame Manner? How come ſuch as call themſelves *Chriſtians* to condemn Epiſcopal Churches, for that Superiority and Subordination which was inſtituted by our bleſſed Saviour, and took Place in the Apoſtolick Churches? *Nothing can be more ſurprizing than to find People, ſet up Forms of* human Invention, *in Oppoſition to the* Inſtitutions *of God. and* Scripture Practice, *and at the ſame Time to entitle their Books,* Scripture Plea's.

The Miſchiefs *that have attended this upſtart Government, are ſuitable to its innate* Contrariety *to all divine Inſtitutions; For it never entred into*

into any Country but by Rebellion, *and* reſiſting *the* Ordinance of God, *and by* Blood: *But* Scotland, *of all Country's, has* ſuffered *moſt ſeverely, by having it forc'd on the Subjects of that Kingdom, by* Solemn Leagues *and* Covenants, *in Deſpite of God's* Vicegerent *King* Cha. I. *and the* Laws *of that* Kingdom: *The Methods then taken were ſo violent, That ſuch as withſtood it, riſqu'd their Fortunes.* How many Families were ruin'd, for no other *Cauſe*, but only for their *refuſing* the *Covenant*? How many were driven into *Exile*, and not ſuffered to breath the Air of their *Native Country*? How many were brought to the *Scaffold* for their faithful and conſcientious *Adherence* to the *King* and the *Laws* of their *Country*, in oppoſition to it? Did not the *Covenant* make its Way by *Sword* and *Rebelling* into *Blood*? *Their* Excomunications *were not deſign'd to reclaim, but to ruin all that would not fall down and worſhip their* Dagon: Intercomuning *and* Forfeiture *were the Conſequences of refuſing to do it. The fatal Experience which that* Nation *had formerly, of* Presbyterian Excommunications, *made this* Parliament, *which ſet up* Presbyterian Government, *once more, take away all temporal Penalties which formerly enſued on it; that it might be no more in the Power of the* Kirk (*as it had been in the former Age*) *to* ruin *ſo many Families and Perſons.*

That Rebellion, *which was rais'd in* Scotland, *had no Pretext, but* Presbyterial Government, *and the* Covenant, *which were ſtiled,* The Cauſe

of

of God, (*I mean that* Rebellion *against* K. Cha. I. *That beſt of* Kings *and glorious* Martyr) *which not only* embroil'd *that* Kingdom, *and made it a* Scene *of moſt* direful Calamities *from the moſt flouriſhing* State, *that ever it enjoyed ſince it was a* Kingdom; *But alſo* overſpread *all his Majeſty's Dominions; and was not extinguiſhed with his* Blood; *nor the* Nations *delivered from the diſmal Effects of it, until God was pleas'd to* reſtore K. Cha. II. *The* rightful Heir: *Theſe are ſome of the Fruits of* Presbytery, *by which we may judge, if it be a Tree of God's planting.*

But I ſhall briefly conſider one Objection, *which Reſpects the Behaviour of* Diotrephes, *who lov'd the* Pre-eminence; *This they apply to the* Biſhops *having Authority over* Presbytery; *and they themſelves muſt be reckoned very humble, for putting all* Eccleſiaſticks *upon a* Level, *and* beating *down all* Superior Orders *in the* Church. *But, if they would be pleas'd to conſider that Place calmly, they might diſcover their own* Pride, *under that* affected Humility, *and their* trampling *upon that* Precedency *and* Superiority, *with* Pride *and* Ignorance, *for* Pre-eminence *is not the Thing, that is there condemn'd, but the undue affecting of it: And* Diotrephes's Rebellion *againſt the* Apoſtle *St.* John *his undoubted* Eccleſiaſtical Superior: But *Diotrephes*, who loveth to have the Pre-eminence among them, receiveth us not—prating againſt us, (the *Apoſtles*) with malicious Words 3 *Epiſt.* John 9. 10. *This was his* Crime, *and it ſeems to be much of Kin to that*

of

of Presbyters *opposing their* Bishops, *and like so many* Diotrephes's affecting the Pre-eminency, and engrossing to themselves, and their Consistories the plenitude of Church Power; *And not only* withstanding *their lawful* Ecclesiastical Superiours, *to whom they had sworn* Canonical Obedience, *and separating from them, but also presuming to* Depose *and* Excommunicat *their* Orthodox Bishops; *as they did at* Glasgow, Anno Domini 1638. *Their Behaviour was very like to that of* Corah's, *and his Accomplices, who* rebelled *against* Moses *and* Aaron *their Civil and Ecclesiastical Superiors.*

In short, Let the Esopresbyteroi, or Presbyterians *think of this Matter what they please, there is scarcely any Thing more clearly delivered to us in the holy* Scriptures, *than that there was a great* Inequality, *with regard to Power and Dignity, among the* first Ministers *of the Christian Religion, throughout the whole new Testament.* Ordination *and* Jurisdiction, *or the Exercise of Ecclesiastical Government, was still perform'd by Persons of a* superiour *Order to* Presbyters: *And there is not one Instance in the whole Canon of the* Scriptures, *of Ordination or Jurisdiction by mere* Presbyters, *acting in* Parity; *though it be as clear as Light, that others of a* superior *Order did ordain both* Deacons *and* Presbyters *and govern* Churches: *For besides, that these Powers cannot be refus'd the* Apostles, *we have others who were subordinate to them, thus employed,* 1 Tim. *Chap.* 5. *Ver.* 19. *and* Titus 1. 5. *Now, how any Society of mere* Presbyters, *come to*

be

be vested with those Powers, is, what I am not able to comprehend. Presbyterian *Government seems to me, to be a very* novel humane Institution *in Comparison; and the Reverse not only of the Government of the* primitive *Church* (Calvin *himself being Judge,* Lib. 4to Inst.) *but also of the* Institution *and Government of the Christian Church, as deliver'd to us in holy* Scripture.

No doubt but the Apostles *general Precept, ordering* all Things to be done decently and in Order, *authorizes the Church to determine many* Circumstances *of Government and Worship; and the* Authority *and* Practice *of the Church is the Rule and Measure of a Christians Behaviour in these Cases,* But if any be contentious, we have no such Custom, neither the Church of God. *Upon the Authority of those* Texts, *and from the nature of Government, the Asserters of* Episcopacy *have sufficiently vindicated the Church as to her Appointments, with Respect to* Order *and* Decency, *without alledging particular Texts of Scripture for every Circumstance that relates to* Religion; *And did the Controversy with the* Presbyterians *turn upon such* Points, *so they were in the Right as to the Main; I should be far from quarrelling with them: But seeing they* pretend to Scripture, *both for their Constitution, and every Thing that is peculiar to it; this is provoking to any Man who is convinced, that their whole* Model *of Government, is* contrary *to it, to shew his Abhorrence of such assuming Boldness.*

I ſhall, in the laſt Place, adreſs my Country-men of the Presbyterian *perſwaſion, who have* Zeal *for* God, *and a due regard for the* Holy Scriptures, *in a few words; And beg of them to read and conſider theſe very* Scriptures *with attention: Let them conſider the* Inſtitutions *of God Almighty, with relation to the* Miniſtry *and* Government *of his* Church, *under the* Law, *which was the* Chriſtian Church *under another Diſpenſation,* 1 Cor. 10 *And the* Inſtitutions *of our bleſſed Lord and Saviour* Jeſus Chriſt, *and the* Practice *of his* Apoſtles; *And I am hopeful that they who are not blinded with Prejudice, ſo as to ſhut their Eyes againſt the Light, will ſoon be convinced that the Church of God, under both Diſpenſations, hath by divine Appointment, enjoyed Miniſters of* different Ranks *and* Orders, *who were moſt certainly* diſtinguiſhed *by Marks of* Authority, Power, *and* Dignity, *as well as* Precedency *in thoſe of* Superior Orders, *from other* Eccleſiaſticks *who were* Subordinate *to them. The different Functions of the Chriſtian Miniſtry, are moſt elegantly ſet forth by St.* Paul, *by the Reſemblance and Compariſon he makes between the* natural Body *and the* myſtical Body *of* Chriſt, *as has been already obſerved, where he pleads for* different Orders *of* Goſpel Miniſters, 1 Cor. 12. 12.

Object. *One main and popular* Objection *againſt* Epiſcopacy (*which preſerves a ſcriptural and primitive* Diſtinction, *and* Subordination *among the* Clergy) is, that People are not ſo much edified by the Clergy of that Perſwaſion, as they are by the *Presbyterians: And many well meaning People*

 have

have been impos'd upon by this very Pretence, tho' it be as certain, that others having itching Ears, could never be ſatisfied with their own Miniſters, whether Epiſcopal *or* Presbyterian, *but were continually ſtragling about for* new Teachers: *To this I* Anſwer, First, *That no People of any* Communion *underſtand better, the Doctrine, or* govern *their* Practice *more conſtantly and regularly, according to the Rules of* Chriſtian Religion, *than ſuch as from a Principle are of the* Epiſcopal Communion. Secondly, *It is falſe to ſay, That* Edification *is only, or beſt to be had with the* Presbyterians, *or Miniſters acting, or governing in* Parity; *for ſuch a Poſition as theirs, affirms as much, as that the* Inſtitutions *of God and Chriſt, are not for Edification, which they ought to conſider; it being evident, that* Imparity *among* Church-men, *was appointed under both* Diſpenſations, *and with a particular Regard to the* Edification *of the* Church: *For, when the* Apoſtle *recites ſeveral of the different Orders of Miniſters, which Chriſt beſtowed from on High;* Some Apoſtles, ſome Prophets, *&c. He adds, that all thoſe, however dignified or diſtinguiſhed, were given* for perfecting of the Saints for the Work of the Miniſtry, for the edifying of the Body of Chriſt; till we all come in the Unity of the Faith, and of the Knowledge of the Son of God unto a perfect Man, unto the Meaſure of the Stature of the fulneſs of Chriſt; That we be no more Children toſs'd to and fro, and carried about with every wind of Doctrine by the ſlight of Men, and cunning Craftineſs, whereby they lay

lay in wait to deceive, *Eph.* 4. *Chap.* 11, 12, 13, 14. Verſes, *From which it is moſt infallibly certain, that our Saviour gave* different *Orders of Miniſters for the* Edification, Peace *and* Unity *of his* Church, *and to ſecure Chriſtians againſt* Deceivers, *falſe* Doctrine, Levity *and* Unconſtancy *in the* Faith. *Can Men provide better for the Edification of the Body of Chriſt, than he himſelf, in whom are all the Treaſures of Wiſdom and Knowledge, has done? Are theſe Men who take upon them to* New Model *the Church, wiſer than the* All wiſe God, *and our* Saviour? *Muſt they make a comely* Superiority *and* Subordination *in the Miniſtry (which God at firſt appointed, and which in all Ages has been preſerv'd) to croſs the great Deſign of our Religion? Will they ſay, that what God appointed for* Edification *is for* Deſtruction? *Muſt they ſtill* preſer, *not only their* late Inventions, *to divine Appointments, but alſo* reproach *them? Were the Churches of* Britain *edified by being deſtroyed by the* Rebellions *after the Year of God* 1638? *Did not more* damnable Doctrines, Blaſphemies *and* Enthuſiaſm *prevail in* England, *after they pull'd down* Epiſcopal Government, *which was the Fence of its Religion, in very few Years, than had been broached there in fourſcore Years time before that? And did not the Oppoſition that was made to* Epiſcopacy, *and the Endeavours to ſet up* Presbytry *or Independency, occaſion the crumbling that glorious* reform'd Church *into ſo many* Factions, *and* Fractions, *many of which continue to this Day? Are there not different Communions,* Altars *againſt* Altars, *and the Unity of the Church*

thereby loſt, as to the Diſſenters of all Kinds? I wiſh the Presbyterians *may conſider what I have ſaid,* And God grant unto them a right Understanding in all Things, which he has appointed for the Edification, Peace, Order, and Unity of his Church.

The Presbyterians *of* Scotland *have outdone all others, by their high* Pretenſions *to greater Purity and a more thorough Reformation; yea, it was not enough for them to* reform Epiſcopacy *out of that Church, but they muſt reform other Churches after their* Model, *and* ſwear *ſolemnly to do it. But of late their Zeal in that Matter is much cooled, for not only the ſurviving* Covenanters *themſelves, but their* Poſterity (*who according to their Opinion, took the Covenants in their Father's Loins*) *reckon little or nothing of the Obligation of theſe* Oaths. *I have no mind to reproach them with burying the* Covenants, (*as I have known ſome of their own Friends do*) *ſeeing* unlawful Oaths oblige only to Repentance, both the impoſers and takers of them: *And I wiſh nothing more than their* Repentance, *for the crying Sins of thoſe Days of* Reformation, *or rather* Deformation; *which, to inhance their Guilt, were committed* in the Name of the Lord; *and which, I am afraid, are not expiated to this Day, tho' the Land has mourn'd for them. We may ſay with* Zippora, a Bloody Covenant it has been to *Britain, having coſt it firſt and loſt not only a* Hecatomb, *but perhaps above an hundred thouſand Lives of Men, Women and Children, many of whom were* Murdered *in cold Blood, as at the Caſtle of* Duntelegh

telegh, Dunoon *and many other Places. The* Reader, *who would have a more particular Account, may consult* Sir George M'kenzie's Vindication of the Reign of K. Cha. II. *and* Bishop Guthrie's Manuscript: *And for* Murdering *Women and Children, the* Bridge *of* Linlithgow *stands to bear Witness. Unhappy* Britain *was the Scheue on which these* Tragedies *were acted, and the Blood of those vast Numbers of People spilt, which did run like so many Torrents. No* Ranks, Quality, *or* Degrees *of* People, *were exempt from sharing in that general* Destruction, *which the* Covenant *made, or occasioned,* from him that sat on the Throne, to her that grinded at the Miln. *No Orders of Men,* Ecclesiastical *or* Civil. *No Age from the hoary Head to* Children in their Mothers Bellies, *from the Year of God* 1640, *to the Year* 1660. *This was* Reformation *with a Witness!*

But the Abetters of Presbyterial Government *(tho' they cannot be ignorant, that it involv'd three flourishing Kingdoms in* Blood *and* Ruin, *who, possibly before those* Rebellions *broke out, were in the most* prosperous Condition *that ever they had been in since they were Kingdoms) would have us to believe it to be not only an innocent Thing, but of the last Consequence to* Religion; *Yea, the very Kingdom of Christ on Earth, and the only Mean to retrieve* Religion *in the Power of it. And the* Presbyterians *of* Scotland *have got it set up as the Government of Christ's Church upon Earth, and* Episcopacy *condemned as an insupportable* Grievance.

Now

Now I ſhall apeal to the People of that Country, where Presbytry *is eſtabliſhed by a* Law, *whether after* 30 *Years Experience of it, they have found ſuch happy Effects of it? Are the People become more* Orthodox *in the* Faith, *or improv'd in their* Morals? *Are they become more* Righteous, Sober, *and* Godly *than they were under* Epiſcopacy? *Would God that it were ſo with them; for 'tis only* Righteouſneſs *that exalteth a* Nation. But for all this obeying of the Commandment of the Lord, what meaneth the bleating of the Sheep, and the lowing of the Oxen? *What means ſuch avow'd* Wickedneſs *in high Places? Are not ſome* Supporters *of* Presbytery *the* Scandal *of* Chriſtianity? *Do not ſo many live there, as if they courted the* Scandal, Infamy, *and* Damnation, *as well as the Pleaſure of their* Sins? *Do not ſuch ſcandalous Perſons, as ſell themſelves to commit horrid* Sins *eſcape without Cenſure? If I am not much miſinform'd,* Vice *was never ſo rampant and impudent there, as it has been of late Years; nor were there ever ſo many* Hero's *for the* Devil, *who are not only abandon'd to Wickedneſs, but alſo boaſt of it, and Glory in their Shame,* Atheiſm *and* Deiſm *were ſcarce ſo much as heard of there, till of late Years.*

This I only hint at to oblige the Presbyterians, *either to take more Care to make People reform their Lives; otherwiſe to abate a little of their great* Pretenſions *of being ſuch effectual* Reformers: *And to conſider what partial* Judges *they are, to lay the blame of whatever* Wickedneſs *was formerly*

merly committed, at the Door of Epiſcopacy; and yet more ſcandalous Offences eſcape without Cenſure, under their Government. I own freely, that if the Biſhops, and the Clergy which were ſubject to them, did not make uſe of that Authority and Power of Diſcipline, wherewith Chriſt entruſted them, for the puniſhment of ſcandalous Offenders, (which I hope they did) they have much to reckon for; and without Repentance, may be afraid of greater Judgments, than thoſe which they have already ſuffered, becauſe that had been a betraying the Commiſſion given them independent upon any Power on Earth, and for which they are accountable to God. Nothing provokes God more to ſevere Executions againſt a Clergy, than Faults of this nature. The primitive Biſhops maintain'd the Vigour of Diſcipline, which both the Clergy and Laiety felt, when they deſerv'd: And no Church can hope to laſt long, that parts with its Diſcipline, and does not make uſe of the Keys, with which they are entruſted; yet all Churches are more or leſs faulty in this Matter. But why ſhould the Presbyterians (who have all the Encouragements they can deſire of the State,) not inflict their Cenſures on thoſe, who are moſt Scandalous, and yet at the ſame Time reproach others for the ſame Fault: But this is no new Thing with them, to be gentle to their Friends; for ſome of the greateſt and moſt leading Men among the Covenanters, and moſt implacable Enemies to the King and Biſhops, were at the ſame Time moſt notorious Adulterers; but they were excus'd, be-

cauſe

cauſe they were as good to God an other way; That is, *they were* Zealous *for the* Cauſe of God, *for ſo* Presbytery *was ſtill'd in thoſe Days.*

And indeed the Presbyterians *of* Scotland *have nothing to ſhew of the Peoples being more* edified *or* reform'd *in* Manners, *but on the contrary, it appears, that* Errors, Infidelity, Blaſphemies, *and all ſorts of* Debaucheries, *do more abound, and are more bare fac'd and impudent under its Influence than formerly: Tet alas! the* Judgments of God *on that* Kingdom *have not fail'd to accompany it, as they did under its laſt* Tyrannical *and* Arbitrary Reign; *For 'tis too apparent, that his ſore and heavy* Judgments *the* Sword, Contagious, *and* expidemical Sickneſs, *which ſwept away vaſt Numbers of the Inhabitants, even to* Deſolation *in many Places of that* Country, *and ſeveral Years of* Famine, *grievous and unſupportable* Loſſes *in their authoriz'd* Undertakings *as to* Trade, *which they entred upon with a great Stock of Money, and with a ſufficient Body of* good Men, *being encourag'd and depending on* Acts *of* Parliament, *and* Royal Patents, *but were baffled; moſt part of their Men, their* Colony *of* Darien *moſt of their* Ships *and* Effects *were irrecoverably loſt; beſides the Burning of the beſt and moſt beautiful Buildings of the* Metropolis *firſt, and of late a great Fire broke out in that ſame City, which has ruin'd a great many Families. To all which may be added, that* Maſſacre *of* Glenco, *which the* Parliament *of that* Kingdom *took into their Conſideration, if* Arguments *cannot prevail, yet it might*

might be expected, that the Judgements *of God might awaken People to consider calmly the Merits of the* Presbyterial *Government, for these seem to be its inseparable Concomitants in that Nation. And altho' God has given them Respite at present, yet I think, what they have already suffered calls loudly on them, to think upon their Way, and to search for the Causes of such dreadful Calamities. Now, seeing the Knowledge of the Nature and Symptoms of a Disease, is necessary towards its Cure, I shall trace* Presbytry, *and shew what Part it acted, and what were the Consequences of it in the Reign of King* Charles I. *should I compare it to the* Viper, *that makes its Way into the World through the Sides of its Parent, I cannot be much blam'd. The first Thing that the Covenanting* Presbyterians *did, was, to raise a most wicked* Rebellion *against that most religious* King *who was not only their* Natural, *and* undoubted Lord *and* Soveraign, *but also Bone of their Bone, and Flesh of their Flesh. He had been so gracious to them, that, even, contrary to his own Inclinations, he gave way to the Establishment of* Presbytry *in* Scotland, *and made such Concessions to them, that in the Parliament which he held in Person at* Edinburgh Anno Domini 1640, *they own'd themselves fully satisfied, and that he had given them full Content; yet no sooner did the* long Parliament *of* England *commence a* Rebellion *against the* King, *but the* Covenanters *took Part in it, and sent an Army to their Assistance. But it was not long ere God avenged himself of that Land, by sending*

againſt it, the Sword *and the* Peſtilence *together, and then* Famine: *But they being* uncorrigible *under the Judgments of God, and* Rebelling *more and more againſt his* Anointed, *and oppoſing themſelves againſt his* Loyal Subjects, *who according to their Alledgance, took Arms for the* King, *under the Command of his General, the Marquis of* Montroſe, *and afterwards, under the Command of Duke* Hamilton, *to reſcue and deliver the* King, *out of the Hands of bloody* Sectarians; *They came at laſt, to be* enſlav'd *under the Toke of that* execrable hypocritical Uſurper Oliver Cromwel, *and the ſcum of their Neighbour Nation, after that bloody, ambitious Wretch had in the moſt horrid Manner* murthered his Royal Maſter, and driven his Family into Exile, *and in this Condition they continued, till the happy* Reſtoration *of King* Charles II. *ſet that Kingdom free from* Uſurpation *both in* Church *and* State.

It is ſtrange, that among all the Reaſons of their publick Faſts, which were commonly kept on the Lords-Day (*tho' all* Chriſtians *obſerved that* Day, *as the* Day *which the Lord hath made for them to* Rejoice, *and be glad in it, it being the weekly Commemoration of our Saviour's* Reſurrection,) *They never took notice of their ſinful* Rebellions, *which they had multiplied againſt the* Ordinance of God; *nor for their barbarous Treatment of an* Orthodox Clergy, *Whether* Biſhops *or Presbyters, both in the Days of the* Covenant, *and ſince the Beginning of the laſt* Revolution, *to ſuch* De-

Degrees of Cruelty, as the Jews *did perſecute the* Prophets, *which God ſent to them. Is there no-thing ſacred in* Kings, *or the* Prieſts *of God, to co-ver them from* Rebellion *and* Violence? *Is not* touch not mine anointed, and do my Prophets no harm, *a* Text *of* ſacred Scripture, *and binding upon* Chriſtians? *Was not* K. Cha. I. *their lawful and undoubted* Soveraign? *Had not he an unque-ſtionable* Right *to their Obedience? Were not the* E-piſcopal Clergy *authoriz'd Miniſters of Chriſt? Were ever their Miniſterial* Acts *declared to be invalid; even by their* Enemies, Perſecutors, Slanderers, *and* Supplanters? *Or was it for perſonal Faults of ſome, that the whole Order was thus barbarouſly treated by them? What Body of Men are without Blemiſhes and Faults, from the* Apoſtles *Times to our Days? If the perſonal failings or Faults of ſome Men, be a ſufficient Reaſon for People to deſtroy their* Clergy, *and to ſubvert the* Church, *no* Church *can hope to continue any Time; And its like* Presbytery *in* Scotland *deſerves to have its* exit *now, as it had formerly. But God was pleas'd in his Providence to place ſuch* Lights *in that* Church, *in thoſe Days, that Poſterity bleſſes God for their pious and learned Labours, ſuch as the eminently learned* Dr. Forbes *of* Corſe, *and* Dr. Baron *and many others, who, by the Violence of the* Covenanters *ended their Days in* Exile: *Was it a light Fault in the latter end of the Year* 1688, *and in the beginning of* 1689, *violently to* Rabble, *and throw out ſo many* Miniſters *and their* Families, *from their* Houſes, *in a moſt tem-peſtuous*

peſtuous and rigorous Winter, *after they had beaten ſome of them, and put all the Indignities upon them, that the Malice and Rudneſs of thoſe abominable* Religious Ruffians *could invent, who were hounded out by ſome deſigning* Stateſmen, *and by the* Miniſters? *But God has* aveng'd *himſelf on that Land ſince his* Judgments *have overturn them, and the* Judgments *of* God *are a loud Call to* Repentance, *and oft times makes the ſtouteſt* Sinners *to humble themſelves; tho' ſome defy them, and reſolve, that after their own Ways they will go.* Presbytry *has been ſtigmatiz'd firſt and laſt, with the greateſt* Judgments (Extermination *excepted*) *which the divine Vengeance ſends upon any Nation, and many People in the Kingdom of* Scotland *are ſenſible of it; and yet too many there, ſeem to be fond of* Plagues, *and to* Idolize *that which never fails to bring them along with it. Unleſs People repent for ſuch hainous Crimes, the Land cannot eſcape being miſerable. My deſign is not to upbraid but only to rouze up* People *to think upon their Ways, and to reflect on the diſmal Conſequences of them, to their Country.* And, I pray God to grant them Repentance for thoſe Sins, for which the Land has ſadly ſuffered, and to compaſſionate their native Country, their own Souls and the People whom they have miſled.

Some

Some *QUERIES* by a Gentleman, occasioned by his reading Mr. *Forrester* in St. *Andrews's Plea for Presbytery*, from Scripture, upon these several Heads.

First, CConcerning the Testimony of early *Antiquity*, How far it is to be received as Probative in Matters of Doctrine?

Secondly, Concerning the *Jewish Oeconomy*, How far fulfill'd in, or abolish'd by Christ, or how far to be imitated by the Christian Church?

Thirdly, Concerning the last Appeal in Controversies of Religion.

Fourthly,

Fourthly, How far the *Apostles* are succeeded to, in their Office?

Fifthly, The *Objections* of the *Presbyterians*, against *Timothy*'s being a *Bishop*, are considered.

Sixthly, Some more Questions put to the *Presbyterians*.

Seventhly, whether the *Angels* of the seven Churches, *Rev.* 2. 3. were *Bishops* or mere *Presbyters*.

Eightly, Some farther *Queries*, which the Author thinks necessary for clearing this Controversy, between the *Church* and the *Presbyterians*.

CHAP. I.

Concerning the *Testimony* of early *Antiquity*.

Query I. HOW far the *Testimony* of early *Antiquity* can be allowed for clearing many Places of Scripture, in Matters of Doctrine, and Church Government? There being several Things believed and practis'd almost universally, for which there is no

no positive Command in Scripture, such as *Infant Baptism*; the changing the *Sabbath* into the *Lord's Day*; or that Lay-men and Women should be admitted to receive the blessed Sacrament of the Lord's Supper; or that sprinkling should be allowed instead of dipping in Baptism, *&c.*

And, whether some Things in St. *Paul's* Writings, called by St. *Peter*, in the second Epistle Ch. 3. v. 16. ἐν οἷς ἐστι δυσνόητά τινα *hard to be understood*, does not make the early Histories and Practice of the Church, not only lawful, but also necessary Explainers of some Places of Scripture? If this be refus'd, I demand clear and express Scripture to warrant the Refusal, seeing the Matter of Fact is evident and undeniable; I likewise, once for all, desire clear and express Scripture answers to all my *Queries*; Because the Gentlemen to whom they are address'd, commonly when pinched from Antiquity, reject every Thing, for which Texts of Scripture is not given them, as not to be admitted in Religion and Church Government.

Query II. If it be a fault to think or say, That some places of the Scripture are clear'd by Apocriphal Writings, Whether such a Position does not condemn all *Commentaries* on the Scriptures, and *Sermons*; Especially if there be any thing in them besides Scripture, and comparing one Place of it with another? And what regard is due to their explanatory Doctrine, now that Inspiration is ceas'd?

Query

Query III. Whether the old Rule of the Primitive Fathers, for knowing what is truly *Apostolical*, be ridiculous; St. *Austin* mentions it, writing against the *Donatists*, *Whatsoever the universal Church holdeth, and yet was not instituted by Councils, is truly Apostolical*? If they will not admit it for a Rule, I desire to know what Scripture contradicts it? But, if they allow it to be a good Rule, then I ask, if it does not make for *Episcopacy*? Because it is not denyed that *Episcopacy* was the Form of the Government of the Church very early; and consequently, by the Rule, *Apostolical*; Otherways St *Jerom's toto orbe decretum est*, must be taken for a Decree of a general Council indeed; and so early, that it may be presumed, that no Christian who prefers Truth to a Party, or Interest, will be afraid to be determined by it: Especially, if he considers that the extraordinary Gifts of the Spirit were not then ceased.

Query IV. I desire to know their Sentiment of *Tertulian's* Way of arguing, when he said, *variasse debuerat error Ecclesiarii; quod autem apud omnes unum est, non est Erratum sed Traditum.* Had the Churches err'd, they must have differ'd among themselves; Whatever then is one and the same among them all, came not by Error, but by Tradition, *viz. Apostolical*; And this he must mean, otherwise his Argument would not be Conclusive. Now, if the *Presbyterians* allow of this Argument, they must at the same Time allow of *Episcopacy*.

Query

Query V. Whether our blessed Saviour, before his Ascension, did leave every Thing concerning the Government of his Church positively determin'd, with his *Apostles*, or not? If he did, what need was there of that Inspiration, which all own they had. For in that Case, they would have been furnished with a fix'd Rule to walk by, and would have positive Commands to obey? But if Christ only commanded, and instructed them in general, and gave them the holy Spirit to direct them in the particular Management of the Business entrusted to them, then I ask, Whether that brings not the Matter in controversy to this Issue? *viz.* What did the *Apostles* do in Matter of Fact? And what Government was actually established by them, to be the lasting Government of the Christian Church.

Now, if the Scripture accounts of this Matter of Fact be not so clear in themselves, but that very different Interpretations are fix'd on them; and such as many serious and knowing Men of different Perswasions and Communions, are fully convinc'd, that each of them are in the Right, and that they have the Scripture on their Side, whence shall this Controversy be cleared, as to the true Sense of those Scriptures, but from the earlier Ages of the Church; and without doubt the nearer to the *Apostles* the better.

Q. VI. If *Miracles* did not cease, before *Episcopacy* obtain'd in the Church, whether does not that shew GOD's Approbation of it? Or may it not be inferr'd at least, that *Episcopal*

Government, if it be not expressly appointed by GOD, yet it is not contradictory to, nor inconsistent with his Pleasure, and the Marks of a true Christian Church; and consequently Separation from the Communion of an *Episcopal* Church, for its being *Episcopal*, can never be vindicated from the Imputation and Guilt of Schism? I desire the *Presbyterians* to shew any Instance of Separation from the Church in the purest Ages of it, upon the Account of its being govern'd by *Bishops*, tho' all the more learned Asserters of *Presbyterial* Government, allow it had *Episcopacy*.

CHAP. II.

Concerning the *Jewish Œconomy*, how far fulfilled in, or abolished by Christ?

Query. 1. HOW far the *Jewish* Oeconomy is abolish'd by Christ? And whether all of it is not at this Day in Force, and binding upon us? Or at least, If all of it may not be imitated by Christians without Sin, which was not at first truly typical; and so fulfilled in Christ the Antitype? Or *Secondly*, What concern'd the *Jews*, as a distinct People, possessing the promis'd Land, and living among the *Hea-*

then

those Nations, with whom they were forbidden to communicate in most Things? Or, *Thirdly*, In what was abrogated by our blessed Saviour himself, or by his Apostles?

Now, If this much be not allowed, nor a Liberty to argue from their Constitution to ours; how comes the Decalogue to be binding, and to be a Law to us; and many Things of their Law, particularly the 20th Chapter of *Leviticus*, which regulates the Causes of Marriage, forbidding all within certain Degrees of Consanguinity or Affinity to be married together? If it be answered, that the moral Part of the Law only is what we are bound to observe. I reply *First*, That Marriage within the Degrees which are forbidden in that Chapter, is not against any moral Law, it being allow'd by GOD not only to the Children of our first Parent, but also preach'd by the Patriarch *Jacob* and others; and moral Laws are what GOD does not dispense with. And *Secondly*, Does not our blessed Saviour's Saying, Matth. 5. 17. *I came not to destroy the Law, but to fulfill it*, prove, That the whole Law is still in Force, unless in so far as it was abrogated, or concern'd the *Jews* only as a particular Community? For the Word πληρῶσαι signifies not only to fulfill, but to perfect and fill it up; and the Righteousness of Christians must exceed that of the Scribes and Pharisees, who were the strictest Sect of the *Jews*, they sat in *Moses*'s Chair: And any Body that reads the Sermon in the Mount, may soon be convinc'd,

that our blessed Saviour rais'd even the moral Law to a higher Pitch than the *Jews* thought of, in several Instances, as his *forbidding causeless Anger, and commanding us to love our Enemies*, &c. or at least, if it may not be observ'd and imitated without Sin.

Q. II. Whether it deserves not to be remarked, That tho' the *Jewish* Church, while our blessed Saviour was on Earth, was very corrupt and degenerate, not only in Practice, but also in its very Constitution and fundamental Principles; yet he did not separate from their Communion, tho' he often reproved sharply their Vices and Errors: Yea, he commands the People to *observe, and do whatsoever the Pharisees commanded and bid them do; for they sat in* Moses's *Chair*, S. Matth. 23. 2, 3. &c. that is, The Scribes and Pharisees are your lawful Superiors, succeeding *Moses* and the seventy Elders; therefore do you live in Obedience to all their lawful Commands, but not after their Example. They were to be own'd as lawful Church Officers by the People, notwithstanding their Immoralities and Errors were such, that our blessed Saviour warns his Followers to *beware of them*, and the People not *to do after them*; yet he does not allow them to forsake their Communion, or to separate from them for their personal Faults or erroneous Doctrine.

Q. III. Whether our blessed Saviour's choosing Twelve Apostles, according to the Number of the Tribes, and seventy Disciples of a lower Order,

Order, answering exactly to the *Jewish* Sanhedrim: And again, his adopting two *Jewish* Rites, which had obtain'd in the Church, tho' they were not appointed in the Law, *viz.* the *Postcœnium* and Baptism, to be the Two Sacraments of his Church? Whether does not this I say shew, that our Saviour was not for altering, or leaving out any Thing of the old Oeconomy, which was capable of being made Use of to Advantage in the new?

Q. IV. If it be lawful to argue from the old Constitution to the new, as the Apostle does in the Epistle to the *Hebrews*, in many Places, particularly as to the Gospel Ministry, *Heb. Ch.* 5. *Ver.* 4? Then I ask, whether that Citation in *Acts* 1. 20. *And his Bishoprick let another take*, does not prove, that the Apostles were Bishops; and if they were, why not succeeded by Bishops, as well as seeing they were Presbyters and Deacons, they were succeeded to by such? The following Query will shew the Meaning of the Word *Bishop* in the old Testament? I also ask, whether the History of the Election of St. *Matthias* to succeed *Judas*, does not shew, that the Apostles thought, that they ought and must be succeeded to as such?

Q. V. Whether the Orders of Levites and Priests, having by God's own Appointment, Overseers called in the *Septuagint*, which is the same Language with that of the new Testament, Bishops; and those Overseers, one over them, or an Archbishop, besides *Aaron*, who was the

Type

Type of *Chriſt* our High Prieſt, does not make for *Epiſcopacy* in the Chriſtian Church?

Object. If it be objected, that this is a *Popiſh* Argument; for, by Parity of Reaſon it might be inferr'd, that there ought to be one chief *Biſhop* or *Pope* over the whole Chriſtian Church, ſeeing the *Jews* had but one high Prieſt.

Anſw. I anſwer, that it ought to be conſidered, that under the Law they had but one *Temple* and one *Altar*; and it was not lawful for them to offer Sacrifices upon any other Altar, nor in any other Place, but in that which the Lord their God did chooſe to place his Name there, *Jeruſalem* and the one Temple there, which makes that Nation but one Province; ſo the utmoſt that they can infer from the one high Prieſt in the *Jewiſh* Church, is, that every national Chriſtian Church ought to have a *Metropolitan* or *Archbiſhop*, to whom the reſt of the Biſhops and Clergy in his Province, ought to be in ſome Subjection, and he to continue their Superior for Life. We have an Account of the *Jewiſh* Epiſcopacy and Arch-epiſcopacy, *Num.* 3, 32. where *Eleazar* the Son of *Aaron* (when his Father was as yet alive, and a Type of *Chriſt* our great high Prieſt) is called *the Preſident over the chief of the Levites.* Now, the Prieſts in the old Teſtament Way of ſpeaking, are comprehended under the more general Name of *Levites*; and that this Chief of Arch-precedency (if I may make Uſe of that Word) was not only over the Levites, as contradiſtinguiſhed from Prieſts;

Priests; but also over the Overseers of Priests, properly so called, is evident from *Nehemiah* 11. 14 and 22. And these Presidents are call'd by the Septuagint *Bishops*, which agrees to the *Hebrew*, and is render'd by the *English* Translators, *Overseers*, which Word being synonymous, they make use of for Bishops, *Acts* 20. 28.

Q. VI. Whether the Word *Sacerdos* or *Priest*, may not be fitly applied to the Ministers under the Gospel? The Aversion which many in the reformed Churches had to that Word, was chiefly from a Mistake, as if the Priests Office consisted only in offering Sacrifices; but if we consult the first Institution of the Levitical Priesthood *Deut.* 10. 8. we shall not find one Word of Sacrifice, but only they were *to stand before the Lord, to minister unto him, and to bless in his Name*; so that it does not appear, that sacrificing was any other Way an essential Part of the Priests Office under the Law, than that Sacrifice was an essential Part of the *Jewish* Worship.

See the Case of the Regal.

The *Ratio formalis* of a Priest, is *one impowered by GOD, to stand as a Midsman between GOD and the People, and to sign and seal the Covenants between them.* It includes all the Manner of Worship which GOD shall any Time appoint; and he may alter it as he thinks fit: Yet the Office of Priesthood remains still the same, as that of an Ambassador, who may receive fresh Instructions, yet his Character and Commission is still the same. We do not read that *Melchisedeck*

dock, who was a great Type of our blessed Savior (after whose Order he is said to be a Priest) did offer Sacrifice; and no *Protestant* Author, that I know of, says that he did, tho' the *Papists* generally affirm it: And they who deny proper Priesthood under the Gospel, yet do not deny, that *Christ* himself is a *Priest for ever*. Now, what Sacrifices has *Christ* to offer? He was sacrificed but once; and if his Intercession upon Account of that Sacrifice be the proper Office of a Priesthood? How can it be denied to the Celebration of that Sacrifice in his holy Supper, and the Intercessions then made by his Priests upon that Account? It cannot be denied, but that there are Sacrifices under the Gospel, tho' not of Beasts. I desire my Adversaries, who doubt of this, to read 1 *Pet.* 11. 5. and *Heb.* 13. 10. 15, 16. *Rom.* 12. 1. yea, and an Altar too in the Text I have cited. *Isaiah* calls the Ministers of the Gospel Priests in Chap. 66. 21. And so does *Jeremiah* Chap 33. Ver. 18. prophecying of the Times of the Gospel. St. *Cyprian* and all the Ancients, still retain'd the Word Priest, for a Minister under the Gospel, and the Churches in all Places ever since his Days, except some of late.

Q. VII. Whether they who refuse the Name of *Priests*, and take the Title of *Ministers* of the Gospel, ought not also to refuse to live by the Altar, to use the *Apostles* Expression, or at least not to receive *Tithes*? For these are as much antiquated *Jewish* Names, and Things, as the

Word

Word and Office of *Prieſt*, or *Sacrifice*, in a Chriſtian Senſe. It appears from what has been ſaid, That both the *Word* and *Office* of *Prieſt* was before the *Levitical Law*, under it; and is very proper to the ſtate of the Church under the Goſpel.

CHAP. III.

Concerning the laſt *Appeal* in Controverſies about Matters of *Religion*.

Query I. HOw are *Controverſies in Religion* to be determined? If by the Scriptures, how ſhall we come by the true Senſe and Meaning of them, ſo as to have an end put to the Controverſy? I cannot but think, that great Regard is to be had to the Judgment of the Church in all Ages, which collected at firſt thoſe Books which make up compleat the *Canon* of the Scripture; being perfectly aſſured, that they were written by the *Apoſtles*, and other Divinely inſpired Pen-men; having the original Manuſcripts written with the *Apoſtles* Hands, preſerved in the ſeveral Churches ſome Ages, after the Deceaſe of the *Apoſtles* themſelves; and thoſe holy Biſhops and Martyrs

who lived neareſt to the *Apoſtolick Age*, muſt be allowed to have known beſt the meaning of thoſe ſacred Writings: For, tho' the Church has no Authority over the Scriptures, or over our Faith, which is ſo eſtabliſhed, that neither Apoſtles nor an Angel from Heaven can alter it. *Gal.* 1. 8. *Yet the Teſtimony of the univerſal Church in all Ages, as to the Scriptures*, and Nature of that Teſtimony, which has ſuch Marks as are not compatible to any Impoſture, ſeems to me to be infallible; for her Authority is to be ſubmitted to in all Matters of Diſcipline, and great Defreence is due to her declared Senſe in Matters of Doctrine, or to make any Additions to the Chriſtian Faith; and ſhe is a competent Witneſs what that Faith and Doctrine is. Some Books of Scripture were ſooner, and ſome afterwards received into the Canon, as the Epiſtle of St. *James*, the ſecond of St. *Peter*, and the ſecond and third of St. *John*, the *Apocalypſe*, and the Epiſtle to the *Hebrews*, and the Church was at laſt fully ſatisfied of their being *Genuine*, by infallible Proofs, and gave their Teſtimony to all thoſe Books, which have ever ſince been received as *Canonical*; the Reaſon of the Difference was, that ſome of them were not ſo ſoon and ſo generally known as others were.

Query. II. Seing the Church determined the Number of the Canonical Books, which have been univerſally received as ſuch, upon ſuch Evidence of their having been written by the inſpired

inſpired Penmen of them, as that ſhe could not be impoſed upon, conſidering her nearneſs to the Apoſtles, if that be not an Argument, that great Deference is due to her Teſtimony, both as to the Books themſelves, and to her Senſe as to the meaning of them; no doubt the innate Light and Splendor of the Truths contained in them, the Majeſty of the Doctrine, ſanctity, ſublimity, Truth, and its agreeableneſs to Mens Reaſon, and its being perfective of human Nature, and ſecuring our main and everlaſting Concerns, are Arguments, that the Chriſtian Religion has GOD for its Author: And in thoſe Reſpects no other Writtings are to be compared with them, and no doubt God co-operates with the ſerious and unprejudiced reading of his Word, by his holy Spirit, for the Conviction and Comfort of Chriſtians; nevertheleſs, as under the Law *The Prieſts Lips did preſerve Knowledge*, and the People had the Law from his Mouth, as from an Oracle; ſo the Chriſtian Church which is the Pillar and Ground of Truth, and which has the Promiſe of the *Holy Ghoſt*, to lead her into all Truth, is the great depoſitary of the Faith, and of the Scriptures which contain it; and by Conſequence, ſhe is the beſt Guide in doubtful Matters. The Repreſentatives of the ſeveral Churches, after the *Apoſtles* left the World, which were the *Biſhops*, could beſt know what Faith had been received in their reſpective Churches, eſpecially when GOD vouchſafed many of them, extraordinary

Aſſiſtance of the *Holy Ghoſt*. This Method was taken againſt *Arius* when the Biſhop of *Alexandria* asked the reſt of the Biſhops who were aſſembled in Counil, *which of you ever heard ſuch Things*? I take this to be the true Method to find out an *Hereſie* or novel Doctrine; and to know the *Catholick* Doctrine which had been univerſally received.

Query III. If we receive not the Scriptures from the Church, whence or upon what Teſtimony do we receive them? If from an inward Teſtimony, I ask whether a *Heathen* will be convinced upon his reading them, either in the Original, or in his own *Language*, that they were dictated by the Spirit of GOD, without any further help? If they affirm, that he will, if it pleaſes GOD to aſſiſt him with his holy Spirit; is not this to beg the Queſtion? ſeeing God, if he pleaſes, can work in him a Belief of the Truths of our holy Religion, either with or without the Scriptures; *for he can bring to paſs whatever he pleaſes*, as well without as by, and with the Uſe of ſecond Means; I think that the Endavours of worthy Divines to perſwade the Belief of the *Chriſtain Doctrine*, from intrinſick Arguments, is very commendable. And all the Enemies of our Religion will never be able to anſwer them: But there are ſeveral Articles of our *Creed*, which we receive, merely becauſe they are revealed to us in the Scriptures, ſuch as the Myſtery of the ever bleſſed *Trinity*, the Incarnation and Satisfactions of *Jeſus Chriſt*, which

which are above human Reason, the general Reſurrection, the Conflagration of the World, and the Sacraments; and the Impudence of *Deiſts*, who meaſure Divine Knowlege or Omniſcience of God by their Reaſon, as if God could reveal nothing above their Reaſon is moſt intolerable: Yet no ſober Chriſtian will ſay theſe Articles are ſelf evident; we believe them upon the Authority of God who has vouchſafed to reveal them to us, and who is Truth it ſelf, and can neither be deceived, nor deceive: And this agrees to the Definition of Faith given us by the Apoſtle, *Heb.* 11. 1. *the being of Things not ſeen but hoped for*, and the Church is certainly our Inſtructer in this Faith, and brings us firſt to believe, tho' our Faith does not reſt finally upon her, but on God, otherwiſe it ſhould not be a Divine, but a human Faith.

Query IV. Whether the Church has Power to introduce and eſtabliſh new Officers under the Goſpel, and expect to have God's Approbation for it afterwards? As the Advice of *Moſes*'s Father in Law for making Rulers of the People, which was *ex poſt facto*, approved of by God; and of them did the *Sanhedrin* conſiſt, tho' it had not its firſt Appointment or Inſtitution from God, or the Inſtitution of the Feaſt of Dedication, the Feaſt of *Purim*, and the adding Baptiſm to Circumciſion; and the *poſtcenium* to the Paſſover, which Rites, tho' not ſtrictly of Divine, but only of Eccleſiaſtical Inſtitution, our Saviour approved of, by making them Sa-

craments

craments under the Gospel: And God Almighty by sending *John* the *Baptist* to baptize; or as the laying aside of somethings which were of Divine Institution: For Instance *Hezekiah*'s destroying the *Brazen Serpent* which God commanded to be made, and never gave any Order that we can find, for destroying it, and yet God was pleased with its being destroyed: The *Paschal Lamb* or the *Passover* was to be eaten with their Loins girt and a Staff in their Hand, a Posture that suited perfectly with the Occasion of its Institution, as appears from *Exod.* 12. & 11. And yet the Church altered that Posture, thus commanded, after they were in Possession of the promised Land, into their ordinary Table Posture to wit *Leaning*, which was common to them with other *Eastern* Nations, and did better agree to their prosperous Condition at that Time; and our blessed Saviour himself did comply with that Alteration which the Church had made, and did eat the *Passover* with his Disciples in that Posture under the Gospel: *Deaconesses*, the holy *Kiss*, not eating of Blood, and anointing the Sick with Oil, in order to their Cure, have been generally laid aside and disused, tho' enjoined and practised by the Apostles, and continued in the Church for some Ages after them.

CHAP.

CHAP. IV.

How far the *Apoſtles* were to be ſucceeded in their Office.

Query I. WHether the *Apoſtles* were not to be ſucceeded to as ſuch? That this *Query* may be the better underſtood, I ask whether at leaſt, *Lay-men* and *Women* be not as effectually debarred from receiving the Sacrament of Chriſt's Body and Blood; becauſe our bleſſed Saviour gave it only to Church Officers, I mean to the *Apoſtles* (who under him, were *Biſhops* of the Chriſtian Church) as that the *Apoſtles* ſhould be without Succeſſors, which the *Biſhops* of the Catholick Church believed themſelves to be from *Chriſt's Promiſe to be with them to the end of the World*, which Promiſe, to be ſure was not reſtricted to the *Apoſtles* Perſons; none but St. *John* outliving that Century, but to the Order. This Promiſe I think, proves as much that the *Apoſtles* were to be ſucceeded to, as ſuch, as that ſaying of our Saviour, *Drink ye all of this*, gives all Chriſtians a Right (as undoubtedly it does) to be admitted to the Lord's Table.

Query

Query II. Seeing there are many Nations in the World after the *Apoſtles* Deceaſe, which were not inſtructed in the Goſpel; and ſome to this Day are not converted to the Chriſtian Religion, Whether the *Apoſtles* who were *to teach all Nations*, were not neceſſarily to be ſucceeded to, at leaſt in that Branch of their Commiſſion? The Reaſon of this *Query* is becauſe ſome affirm that this was extraordinary, and only neceſſary for planting the Chriſtian Faith, and founding the Chriſtian Church, but died with the *Apoſtles*, and was not neceſſary for the Continuance or further Propagation of the Faith.

Query III. Is the effuſion or pouring forth of the *Holy Ghoſt* upon the *Apoſtles*, to be reckoned among the diſtinguiſhing *Marks* of an *Apoſtle*? Seeing the *Holy Ghoſt* fell on others, as well as on them; and that extraordinarly too: So that others who were not *Apoſtles* receiv'd the extraordinary Gifts of the *Holy Ghoſt* which enabled them to work *Miracles, ſpeak with Tongues, utter Propheſies, Interpret and heal the Sick*, and what they did by the extraordinary Aſſiſtance that was afforded them, tended to the Confirmation of the Goſpel, as well as what was done by the *Apoſtles*.

Query IV. Whether was the *Holy Ghoſt*, given by the Succeſſors of the *Apoſtles*, by *Impoſition of Hands*? That they did confer the *Holy Ghoſt* in Confirmation was moſt certainly the Belief of the primitive Church, as is evident from *Tertullian*, St. *Cyprian*, *Firmilian*, and others; from which it may be inferr'd at leaſt, that in the ſe-

cond

cond and *third Centuries*, Imposition of Hands, for giving the *Holy Ghost* after *Baptism*, was not believ'd to be any extraordinary Part of the *Apostles* Office, but was to descend to the *Bishops* in after Ages.

Query V. Whether the Commission, *Matth.* 28. *ver.* 19. To Teach, or make all Nations Disciples, according to the original μαθητεύσατε πάντα τὰ ἔθνη was a distinguishing Mark of an *Apostle*, as some would have it? Or rather, is not that Commission continued to their Successors, whom he has promis'd to be with *to the End of the World*? Whether will a *Presbyterian* Preacher, after he receives *Presbyterial Ordination*, and is settled in a Parish, say, That he is confin'd to it (whersoever he shall happen to be afterwards) until he be remov'd by a Call, Vote of some *Presbytery*, *Synod*, or *General Assembly*, to another? Or, that he is confin'd to one *Nation*, nay, or to preach only to *Christians*? If to one Parish, why does he preach out of it? If to one Nation, Why does he preach in another? If he be restricted to Christian Countries, Whether does not that shut the Doors of their Church, against all such as are without, to wit, *Jews*, *Mahumitans*, and *Heathens*! But if none of these Restraints bind absolutely, then they *are not in the Nature of the Office*, *or essential to Ordination*, but only for maintaining Order in the Church; and consequently, the Universality of the *Apostles* Commission *to teach all Nations*, can be no Argument a-

gainſt their having Succeſſors, even as to that Branch of the Office *Apoſtolical*.

Query VI. Seing it is evident from what has been already ſaid of Chriſt's Promiſe, *to be with his People to the End of the World*, that it belongs alſo to the Rulers or Biſhops of the Chriſtian Church; I would gladly know from clear Scriptrue, what Part of the Apoſtolick Office does not appertain to their Succeſſors? Or what Part of it is excluded from its Share of this Promiſe, which reaches to the End of the World? That that Promiſe is ſure to the Church, as long as the Church continues on Earth, is the unanimous Judgment of all Commentators on that Text; but if the *Fresbyterians* will affirm, That *the End of the World* refers to the laſt Period of the Apoſtles Lives, and that he had no other Apoſtles beſides them to be with, ſuch a Commentary (like the *Gloſs* of *Orleans*) does abſolutely overthrow his Text.

Query VII. Whether it be credible that St. *Paul* acted as a ſingle Presbyter at the Ordination of *Timothy*, and not as an Apoſtle? Or, that he laid aſide his Apoſtleſhip, and put himſelf on a Level with mere Presbyters, to give an Example of Parity, and to ſhew after Ages the Authority of Presbyters acting in Parity, without any Preſident in conferring Orders? Or, if this was St. *Paul's* Practice, ſuppoſing he came where there was ſuch a College of Presbyters, without one over them? I deſire

plain

plain *Scripture* Proof, from the Aſſertors of ſuch Poſitions.

Query VIII. Whether the *Presbytry* which St. *Paul* mentions as concerned in *Timothy*'s Ordination conſiſted of mere Presbyters? Or, if the Perſons who accompanied St. *Paul* in his Return from *Macedonia* through *Aſia*, and whoſe Names you may find, *Acts* 20. *ver.* 4. were mere Presbyters. *Timothy* himſelf was one of them; and it is not without Reaſon that ſome ſay, That St. *Paul* ordained *Timothy*, with the Conſent or Concurrence of thoſe Perſons. Certainly it could be no Presbytery acting in Parity, if St. *Paul* was one of the Number, (as beyond all peradventure he was) unleſs it was a College of *Apoſtles*: Beſides, *Timothy* is called an *Evangeliſt*; or at leaſt, is bid to do the Work of an *Evangeliſt*. Now, how is it conceivable, That mere Presbyters would take upon them to Ordain an *Evangeliſt*? The *Preſbyterians* inſiſt much upon this Topick of his being an *Evangeliſt*, when they endeavour to diſprove *Timothy*'s being a *Biſhop*, but if *Presbyters* as ſuch, have Power and Authority to ordain *Evangeliſts*, Why did not our Presbyterian Miniſters exerciſe that Power, and ſend *Evangeliſts* to the unconverted Nations? *Fruſtra eſt potentia quæ non reductus in actum*, is an undoubted Maxim: But if the Office of an *Evangeliſt* be an Office Superior to that of a mere Presbyter, as St. *Paul* makes it, *Eph.* 4. 11. How could mere Presbyters confer it? *This is to make the Effect*

exceed its Cauſe. No Perſon or Order of Men can beſtow any Power which they have not themſelves, unleſs they have it only to give away, as the Electors of the Empire: Beſides, 'tis clear from the *Epiſtles* of *Timothy*, that St. *Paul* gave him Power to ordain Presbyters, and made him not only their Superior, but their Judge alſo, to whom they were accountable; he had Authority to receive or reject Accuſations againſt them, and to make uſe of ſuch Diſcipline as might be neceſſary for the good Government of the Church of *Epheſus*, 1 *Timothy* 5. 19.

Query IX. Whether it had been improper ſpeaking in St. *Paul*, ſuppoſing the Presbytery 1 *Tim.* 4. 14. to be the College of *Apoſtles*, or at leaſt a *Quorum* of them, (for a College of Presbyters, ſtrictly taken, it could not be) that he meant only his own Hands, as he ſays 2 *Tim.* 1. 6. when he ſaid in the other Place, by the Hands of the Presbytery, meaning the Conſent of the Apoſtolick Seniority or Presbytery; becauſe, what one did authoritatively, was equal as if done by them all: For even in our modern Presbyterial Ordinations, one is allowed to be a lawful Miniſter of the Kirk of *Scotland*, who has been ordain'd by the leaſt Number of their Miniſters; or would they diſclaim one of their Number from being a Miniſter, if ordained by one only, or reckon it neceſſary or allowable to re-ordain him, or look on any Miniſterial Acts done by him, to be invalid or null.

Query

Query X. If it be certain that St. *Paul* might have ordain'd *Timothy* alone, which I think no Body can doubt of, but that he could have done it, without the Aſſiſtance of the Presbytery; ſuppoſing it to conſiſt of Presbyters in the modern Senſe of them, yet ſeeing the Apoſtle did not authorize them to ordain him of themſelves, but did put his own Hands upon him: Will that ever prove, that it was their Hands alone, or at all, that made *Timothy* an Eccleſiaſtick? Or, is St. *Paul*'s laying on his Hands on *Timothy* with the Presbytery, ſufficient to prove, that a Presbytery, in a modern Senſe, can ordain a Presbyter of themſelves, or that they could do it then without St. *Paul*? For, I ſtill want plain and clear Scripture to prove that St. *Paul* acted there as a ſingle Presbyter or ordinary Miniſter.

CHAP. V.

The *Presbyterians* Objections againſt *Timothy*'s being a *Biſhop* are conſidered.

Query I. WHether St. *Paul*'s Charge to the *Elders* of *Epheſus*, proves that *Timothy* was not there, or that he was not a *Biſhop*?

ſhop? If becauſe they are called *Elders*, they may as well infer, that the *Apoſtles*, who were alſo called *Deacons*, and *Elders* too, were not *Apoſtles*: And to be ſure, the higheſt Order does not exclude, but rather include the inferior and ſubordinate Orders. This is ſufficient to ruin and baffle that Exception of the *Presbyterians*, whoſe Strength lyes only in the *different Acceptations* of one Word, becauſe it infers too much; And by the ſame way of reaſoning, they degrade St. *Peter* and St. *Paul* from being *Apoſtles*, that they degrade *Timothy* from being a *Biſhop*. The word *Elder* denotes *Prefecture*, and in all Languages is applied to *Rulers*, but in the ſecond and third Centuries was applied to *Presbyters* as contradiſtinguiſh'd from and ſubordinate to the Order of *Biſhops*, which the learned'ſt Advocates for *Presbytry* have acknowledged; ſo this is a very unſufficient Objection againſt *Timothy*'s being a *Biſhop*. And St. *Paul*'s not naming *Timothy* particularly in his Exhortation to the *Elders* of *Epheſus*, has as little Force in it, It cannot infer that he was not there, becauſe not nam'd, ſeeing none of the reſt who were preſent are named particularly, but included in the general Compellation. Beſides, it may be preſumed *Timothy* was fully inſtructed in all the Parts of his Office, both by Word of Mouth, and *Epiſtles* which were written to him by St. *Paul*; neither is he excluded from his own Share in that pathetical Exhortation which the *Apoſtle* made to all the *Elders* of *Epheſus*, *Acts* 20.

Query

Query II. Whether *Timothy's* travelling through the *Churches*, either in Company, or as he was ſent by St. *Paul* after his (as is ſuppos'd) Settlement as *Biſhop* of *Epheſus* does prove, that he was not *Biſhop* there? Or whether frequent Travels to different Places for preaching the Goſpel, is any Demonſtration, that the Perſon who is ſometimes thus employed, cannot be *Biſhop* of one particular Church at the ſame Time? What kind of Argument is this from ſuch as maintain, and aſſert, that there were no *Pariſhes*, or *Dioceſes*, diſtinguiſhed and bounded till 260 Years after *Chriſt*? Or whether this Acknowledgment does not equally make for *Dioceſan*, as for Parochial Diviſions?

Query III. Whether a *Biſhop*, while at a Diſtance from his Pariſh or Dioceſs, (for theſe Words were uſed indifferently in the firſt Ages of Chriſtianity) may not delegate ſome Parts of his *Epiſcopal* Power and Juriſdiction to his *Presbyters* for as long Time, as he may ſee it neceſſary or convenient? For we find, that tho' St. *Cyprian* is very angry with, and chaſtiſes ſome of his *Presbyters* ſeverely for preſuming to reconcile the *Lapſers* without his Conſent, even in his Abſence, *Epiſtle* 10. *Parag.* 1. *Pag.* 29. and *Epiſtle* 11. *Parag.* 1. *Page* 32. and *Epiſtle* 12. *Parag.* 1. *Page* 37. according to the Edition of his Works in Folio by *Simon Goulart apud Joan. Zepreux*, *A. D.* 1593. Yet in his Exile, he wrote an *Epiſtle* to his Clergy, exhorting them to do his and their own Office: So that nothing might be want-

wanting in Diſcipline, *Epiſtle* 5. *Parag.* 1. *Page* 15. And to the ſame Purpoſe he ſays in another Letter, *Truſting therefore to your Kindneſs, and Religion, which I have abundantly experienc'd I command and exhort you by theſe Letters, that in my ſtead you perform thoſe Offices which the Eccleſiaſtical Diſpenſation requires.* Epiſtle 6. Parag. 2. Page 17. Which plainly imports a *Delegation*; And by virtue of the Power granted unto them to *take care of the Flock*, thoſe very *Presbyters* reckon themſelves in ſome meaſure *Biſhops*, not *qua Presbyters* but *qua Vicarii* or *Delegates* of their *Biſhop*, Epiſtle 3 Parag. 1. Page 11. Now, if it be certain, that *Biſhops* could and did *delegate* ſome of their communicable Powers to their *Presbyters* for the Exigency of their Flocks in their neceſſary Abſence from them, might not the *Apoſtles* have done the ſame? So *Epiſcopal* Acts done by a Company of *Presbyters* (whatever Inſtance may be brought of ſuch Doings) are not ſufficient to prove any intrinſical *Epiſcopal* Powers to be lodg'd in them, for doing them in Oppoſition to, or excluſive of their *Biſhops*, unleſs it could be prov'd, that they acted without a Delegation, which being a Negative, I think will be hard for the Abbeters of *Presbytery* to prove.

CHAP.

CHAP. VI.

Contains some more *Queries*, which occurr'd to the Author, upon his reading of Mr. *Forrester*'s aforesaid Plea for *Presbytry*.

Query 1. WHETHER the Apostles did not in a great Measure, by Consent, limit and confine their extensive general Commission, authorizing them to teach, and make Disciples of all Nations, by a voluntary Division or Partition to each of themselves of particular Countries and People; and so betook themselves to particular Provinces, as St *Peter*'s being the Apostle of the Circumcision or *Jews*; St. *Paul* of the Uncircumcision or *Gentiles*; St. *Thomas* of the *Indies*, or most eastern Countries.

Q. II. Whether St. *Paul* was not to be blam'd, for not meddling with any Church, which he himself had not planted? Or whether his Practice stands not on Record, to shew his Regularity, and due Observation of the Orders which had been agreed upon among the Apostles, concerning the Division they had made of the World into so many Districts? And whether any of the other Apostles had, without his Consent, intermeddled with the Churches of his planting, when he was alive, even if that Apostle had not

been to blame for ſo doing, after the provincial Diviſion of the World among them?

Q. III. What was the Office of the ſeventy Diſciples? Whether was it extraordinary, or to be ſucceeded to? And if they were to have Succeſſors, who are their Succeſſors? And if they were to be ſucceeded to in the full Extent of their Commiſſion, why are not the Apoſtles ſucceeded to in the full Extent of their Commiſſion, their Office being appointed by our Saviour? And I deſire plain Texts of Scripture in their Anſwer to this Query.

Q. IV. What was the Office of an Evangeliſt? Whether was it any diſtinct particular Office peculiar to them, who were deſigned Evangeliſts? Or was it any particular Employment or Exerciſe of an Office, upon the doing of which, one had Right to the Title of an Evangeliſt? Or was it the Writing the Goſpel of our bleſſed Saviour *Jeſus Chriſt*, that made one an Evangeliſt? If it be appropriated to the Writing of the Goſpel, then there were only Two Evangeliſts, beſides the Two Apoſtles Saint *Matthew* and Saint *John*; and ſome aſcribe the Goſpel according to St. *Mark* to St. *Peter*; ſo that in this Senſe we ſhall only have one Evangeliſt: But ſeeing the Office of Evangeliſt, *Epheſ.* iv. 11. is diſtinct from (tho' included in) that of an Apoſtle, there was undoubtedly ſuch an Office in the Apoſtles Age; and *Philip* and others were deſign'd Evangeliſts in the new Teſtament, whoſe Office I take to be, to *evangelize, preach the Goſpel, and gather Diſciples*, which they might do either

either by Writing, or preaching by Word of Mouth; but that as Evangeliſts, they had not Power and Authority to confirm, *Acts* 8. where we find the Evangeliſt *Philip* preaching, and baptizing the *Samaritans*; but the Apoſtles *Peter* and *John* were ſent to *lay Hands on them* ver. 17. neither had they the Power of Ordination, as they were Evangeliſts, though *Timothy*, who was bid do the Work of an Evangeliſt, did ordain Elders at *Epheſus*; yet no doubt, he did it as veſted with a higher Epiſcopal Power; for conferring ſacred Orders has ever been reckoned as high, if not an higher Act of Power in an Eccleſiaſtick, than laying on Hands in Confirmation is.

Q. V. Whether any Regard be due, or any Credit is to be given to the Accounts of the early Writers among the Chriſtians, ſuch as, *Irenæus*, *Tertulian*, and others, who deliver unanimouſly, that the Biſhops of ſuch and ſuch Churches ſucceeded to the Apoſtles, *Habemus enumerare, qui ab Apoſtolis inſtituti ſunt Epiſcopi in Eccleſiis, & Succeſſores eorum uſque ad nos, etſi recondita myſteria ſciſſent Apoſtoli, vel his maxime traderent ea, quibus etiam ipſas eccleſias committebant, quas & ſucceſſores relinquebant, ſuum ipſorum locum magiſterii tradentes.* We can reckon, ſays *Irenæus*, thoſe Biſhops who were conſtituted by the Apoſtles in the ſeveral Churches, and their Succeſſors down to our Time: And what hidden Myſteries the Apoſtles knew, they would chiefly deliver to thoſe, to whom they committed the Churches themſelves, and whom they left their

own Succeſſors, in the ſame Place of Power and Government as themſelves, *Ireneus adverſus Hereſes* Line 3. Ch. 3. And *Tertullian de preſcriptionibus adverſus Hereticos. cap.* 32. *Edant origines eccleſiarum ſuarum, evolvant ordinem epiſcoporum ſuorum, ita per ſucceſſiones ab initio decurrentem, ut primus ille Epiſcopus, aliquem ex Apoſtolis vel apoſtolicis Viris, qui tamen cum apoſtolis perſeveraverint, habuerit auctorem & anteceſſorem. Hoc enim modo eccleſiæ apoſtolicæ cenſus ſuos deferunt, ſicut* Smyrniorum *eccleſia habens* Polycarpum, *a* Joanne *collocatum refert*; *ſicut Romanorum* Clementem *a* Petro *ordinatum edit, proinde utique & cæteræ exhibent, quos ab Apoſtolis in Epiſcopatum conſtitutos, apoſtolici ſeminis traduce: habeant, confingant aliquod tale Heretici.* Engliſhed, Let the *Heathens* ſhew to the World the Original of their Churches; let them unfold the Order of their Biſhops, who by their Succeſſion deriv'd from the Beginning in ſuch a Manner, as that their firſt Biſhop had one of the Apoſtles or Apoſtolical Men, who perſever'd with the Apoſtles, for his Author or Predeceſſor; for thus the Apoſtolick Churches reckon their Succeſſion: As the Church of *Smyrna* from *Polycarp*, whom St. *John* the Apoſtle plac'd there; and *Rome* from *Clement*, who was likeways ordain'd by St. *Peter*. In like Manner, the reſt of the Churches can name thoſe who were conſtitute in their Biſhopricks by the Apoſtles, and were their genuine Offspring. Let the Hereticks ſhew any ſuch Thing, if they can? Or whe-

whether ſome Diſagreement among eccleſiaſtical Writers, in delivering the Succeſſion of Biſhops in ſome Churches, be a ſufficient Reaſon to reject all Arguments made uſe of by the Fathers againſt Hereticks, who broached and propagated impious novel Doctrines, from that very Topick in the Place I have cited of *Tertullian*? Will the *Presbyterians* diſclaim the Reaſons for the orthodox Faith againſt Hereticks, brought from this very Topick, becauſe of ſome Difference among Authors in the Catalogue of them, both as to the Perſons and the preciſe Time in which they flouriſh'd? If they ſuſtain this for a good Reaſon, then the Gentlemen of Wit, the *Beaux d' Eſprit*, will, or at leaſt ought, to render their hearty Thanks to the Inventers and Abbetors of that Evaſion; and make Uſe of that very Shift againſt ſome Books of Canonical Scriptures; for it cannot be denied, but that the Catalogues differ as to ſome of them: And beſides, there are different Readings of ſeveral Texts of Scripture. Now, if the *Presbyterians* allow, That the greateſt Number of the ancienteſt Copies, ſhall be followed as the greater and more weighty Affair of the Authority of the holy Scriptures, why may they not allow the ſame in the leſs conſiderable Affair of the Catalogues, which hand down the Succeſſion of the Biſhops from the Apoſtles? At the Rate that they oppoſe this Proof for Epiſcopacy, they ruine the Credit of all ancient Hiſtories, in which there are many Things, which will be hard for Chronologers ever to reconcile.

Query VI. Whether that Place in *Ezra*, *Chap.* 2. *Ver.* 61, 62 Where *The Prieſts who ſought their Regiſter, among thoſe that were reckoned by Genealogy, but they were not found; therefore were they as polluted put from the* Prieſthood, or as it is in the Margin of ſome Bibles, *they were polluted from the Prieſthood*: I ſay whether was that a nicety of ſcrutiny, peculiar to the old Œconomy? or was it *Typical*, and as ſuch fulfilled and ceaſed? or was it not rather a *Patern* for us, under the Goſpel to teach us, that ſuch *Office-bearers* in the Chriſtian Church tho' never ſo really and in Fact ſucceeding to the Apoſtles, without any real flaw or Uſurpation, yet unleſs they can clearly derive their Succeſſion from the Apoſtles, or their undoubted Succeſſors, they are not to be own'd by the Church as their genuine Succeſſors, no more than I am obliged to believe a Miniſter now a Days, to be ſuch upon his own bare Affirmation, without any other Evidence.

By a clear Derivation of Succeſſion from the Apoſtles, I mean ſuch Clearneſs as the length of Time from their Days will allow of; eſpecially conſidering the great Perſecutions which have interveened, the Innundations of the barbarous Nations on the Chriſtian, and better civilized Parts of the World, and many other Troubles and Alterations, which are great Enemies to Records. For the Writings of ſome are quit Loſt, and we have only ſome little Fragments of other early Writers. Now, if this be not allowed,

lowed, whether does not the refuſal of it make Holy Orders an uſeleſs Ceremony, and open a Door to any gifted Brother, who is neither really ſuch, or only reckoned ſuch by a few or by many, to invade the ſacred Function of the Chriſtian Miniſtry? We have Inſtances of ſuch Practices in our own Hiſtory, particularly that of the famous Mr. *Robert Bruce*, who did Officiate for no leſs Time then ten Years as a lawful Paſtor, before he was put in Orders. Such Practices are directly contrary to Scripture, which ſays expreſly, *No Man taketh this Honour unto himſelf, but he that is called of* God, *as was* Aaron, *Heb.* 5. *Chap.* and *Ver.* 4. and in the 5. and 6. *Verſes* it is ſaid, *That Chriſt glorified not himſelf to be made an high Prieſt, but he that ſaid unto him, thou art a Prieſt for ever after the Order of* Melchiſedeck. And we find that our bleſſed Saviour when on Earth, appointed and chooſe a ſelect Number of Men whom he alſo named *Apoſtles*, *Luke* 6. 13. He committed to them the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven, to admit unto it upon Repentance, and to exclude the Impenitent. They were his *Ambaſſadors* to Men, and were entruſted with the Miniſtry of Reconciliation, and having told them, *That all Power in Heaven and Earth was given him*; he commiſſionates them, and Promiſes to be with them to the end of the World. Which Promiſe was made appear *Chap.* 4. *Query* 1. to belong to them while they lived, and after them, their lawful Succeſſors in Office, as long

long as the World ſhould laſt. Purſuant thereto, the Apoſtles ordained others, and gave Orders and Rules for preſerving a regular Succeſſion of true Office-bearers in the Church, to the end of the World. the Nature of the Thing makes it neceſſary; for can it be ſuppoſed, That any but an authorized Perſon, ſhould effectually ſeal and ratifie the Covenant between God and Man, bind and looſe, remit and retain Sins, conſign Men to everlaſting Happineſs or Miſery? Or ought any Man to preſume to take this Honour and Office to himſelf, to whom it is not regularly conveyed? Or can People have any reaſonable Aſſurance or Hope, That God will ratifie in Heaven in their behalf, what is done on Earth, by ſuch as have no true *Miſſion*, more than an earthly *King* will ratifie, what is done by one whom he hath never impowered to act in his Name? As it is a great Sin in the *Uſurper*, or ſuch as have not a *Miſſion*, ſo it becomes a great Snare to the People, who are thereby cheated into a Belief that they have the Promiſes, Privileges and Benefits of our moſt holy Religion ſealed and ratified to them, which their falſe Prieſts have no Power to do. And laſtly, whether the Definition which our Saviour gives of a falſe Shepherd or Thief, who entred not in by the Door, *&c.* does not exactly agree to ſuch Miniſters, whoſe Regiſter is not to be found; and, who are not veſted with Authority from God,

theſe

These at best, are but so many withered Hands, through which no Spiritual Blessings can come.

CHAP. VI.

The Business of the Apocalyptick Angels considered, whether single Persons; or if they must be taken in a collective Sense?

Query I. WHETHER (according to *Beza*'s Opinion) the Angels of the seven Churches mentioned in the Revelations of Saint *John* the Divine, be seven Presidents of those seven Churches? If so, then must it not be made appear, that there was some Number of *Presbyters* in each of those Churches, when the Epistles were written to them by the blessed Spirit, which I suppose will puzzle them to prove by Scripture? Now, if they cannot prove this, nor find a Presbytry in each of these Churches, this mars their Scheme of Presbyterial Government, or else they must reject the Opinion of their zealous Friend *Beza*; for according to it, there was a President; and yet they cannot make appear, that there was either Presbytry or Assembly sitting: And it does noways appear, that those Presidents were so oft changed, as they

they are now a Days, by the *Presbyterian* classical Constitution; nay, not that they were changed at all; for the chief Asserters of *Presbytry*, allow of constant Presidents in the first Ages of Christianity; and is it probable, that the Holy Ghost should design them by any Name that imports Presidentship; and yet that the very Thing signified, should be unlawful or sinful in it self, or that they were not to do any Business as such?

Q. II. Whether the Affinity that is between the Stile of the Septuagint Translation of the old Testament, and the Stile made Use of by the inspir'd Writers of the new, be not a very reasonable Ground to infer, that the *Apocalyptick Angels* were above single Presbyters, or any Society of mere Presbyters? My Reason for this Query is, because the Prophet *Malachi* designs the high Priest by that very Word, Chap. II. 7. *For the Priests Lips should preserve Knowledge*; and from thence as from the Oracle, *the People were to require the Law*, to receive Knowledge and Direction for their Duty, because *he is the Messenger of the Lord of Hosts*, or to render it literally, according to the Seventy Interpreters, *Because he is the Angel of the Lord of Hosts*. Now, seeing the seven Epistles which our Saviour sent to the seven Churches, are address'd to the seven Angels of them; It is reasonable to think, that no more is meant by that Word, by which the high Priest was design'd, than so many single Presbyters. These Angels are describ'd by the Hieroglyphick of Stars, to signify their Office to illu-

illuminate, and send out Influences to cherish and rule the faithful under them, as the Sun and the rest of the Stars do this inferior World; and the Churches where they did preside, are called Lychine Sockets for Lamps or Candlesticks, as being the Places where these Stars, as so many Lamps or Torches do shine, where they are set to give Light to all that come into the Room.

Q. III. Whether the Commendation given by the Holy Ghost to the Angels of some of these Churches, for their great Christian Virtues of Patience, constant Adherence to the Faith, *&c.* and the reproving others of them, for suffering gross Heresies and Impieties in their Churches, does not make it more than probable, that the Word *Angel* is not to be taken in a collective Sense; for it is no more likely, that all the Christians in those Churches were to be equally blam'd, for the Faults which are reproved in those Epistles, than that in a Corporation, where there are some that have Deformities in their Bodies, all the Members of that Society should be equally flat nos'd, crooked, blind, deaf, *&c.*

Q. IV. Whether does not the Assertion of those *Presbyterians*, who take the Word Angel in a collective Sense, prove too much, and does Service to the Scheme of the Independents, and ruine the Presbyterial Government? For if *Episcopacy* be not of divine Right, Independency may well claim a Preference to Presbytry, from the Glosses put on those Texts by the *Presbyteri-*

ans, as to the Power of Laymen, and the Independency of parochial Churches; for there appears no Dependency among them, nor any mutual Consent concerning their Government. To be sure there are no Texts of Scripture, by which they can prove either Consent or Dependency in these Churches.

Q. V. Whether there are not figurative Expressions in the holy Scripture? And if when the holy Spirit spake to the Angel of the Church of *Thyatira* first in the singular Number, *Rev.* 11. 18. and afterwards Ver. 24. he says *you*, in the plural Number, there is not a known Figure made Use of, call'd an *Apostrophe*! As if a Master should write to his Steward or principal Servant thus, *Be careful of my Affairs which are entrusted to you*; and thereafter should both say to him, and to all the rest of his Servants; *But take Care that you* (all) *avoid Idleness, and shun Drunkenness, which breed Quarrels*, &c. Or, whether no Regard is to be had to the Kings Manuscript, preserv'd in the King's Library at St. *James*'s, to which learned Expositors of the Scriptures agree, in which we find that Sentence, without the copulative Particle καὶ, we read it thus in them ὑμῖν λέγω τοῖς λοιποῖς τοῖς ἐν Θυατείροις, *Vobis autem dico, ceteris qui* Thyatiræ *estis*, Englished, To you I say, the rest in *Thyatira*, by which a Difference is put between the Angel, with what was said to him in the preceeding Verses; and what is here said to the rest in that Church: And whether or nor, either the

first

first or last of these Opinions, deserve not to be preferr'd, as much more probable than their precarious and groundless Opinion, who take the single Angels of each Church in a collective Sense? By the *actus secundus* of the Council of *Chalcedon*, which reckons Twenty seven Bishops succeſſively in *Epheſus* from *Timothy*, it appears, that the Fathers in that Council thought either *Timothy* or his Succeſſor, to be the Angel of the Church of *Epheſus*, to whom that Epiſtle was ſent απο τε αγιε Τιμοθεε μεχρινον και επισκοπε γενομενε, are the Words of that Council (Engliſhed) From St. *Timothy* to this Time, Twenty ſeven Biſhops have been in *Epheſus*. And *Ireneus* affirms, that *Polycarp* whom he had ſeen, was made Biſhop of *Smyrna* by the Apoſtles, *cap.* 3. And *Tertullian*, who flouriſh'd within leſs than an hundred Years after the Death of St. *John*, ſays, that the Church of *Smyrna* reports, that *Polycarp* was conſtituted Biſhop there by St. *John*, *de præſcriptionibus*, *lib* 32. Now, I deſire the *Presbyterians* to bring ſuch Evidences for the apocalyptick Angels being taken in a collective Senſe, as I have done for their being ſingle Perſons; if I ſhould diſpenſe with them for once from bringing Scripture Proofs for their Aſſertion, becauſe it is not poſſible for them to do it.

Query VI. Whether the Angel mentioned *Revel.* xx. i. *Having the Key of the Bottomleſs Pit*, be to be taken in a collective Senſe? If ſo, by what Rule of Speech is it? Or, what Senſe makes it, that one *Key* muſt have ſo many *An-*

gels

gels, as are neceſſary to make up a Number *collective*, to keep it? And alſo, if that *mighty Angel*, *Revel.* x. i. ii. who delivered a little Book, be *collective*? And the Angel before whoſe Feet St. *John fell* down to worſhip, *Ch.* xxii. *V.* 8. Now, if the Angel be underſtood *collectively*, ſo muſt the following Words, *I am thy Fellow Servant*, &c. And the Meaning muſt be, *We* are thy Fellow Servants: And all of them muſt be ſuppoſed to ſpeak to St. *John* the ſame Words, and at the ſame Time? Now, if the Word *Angel* in all other Places of the *Revelation*, is not taken in a *collective* Senſe, I deſire plain Proofs from Scripture, why the *Seven Angels* of the *Seven Churches*, ſhould each of them be underſtood *collectively*? Unleſs they can give ſome good Account of this Matter, it is begging the Queſtion: It muſt be a very *precarious Foundation* for Presbytery, (which is thought, by its Advocates, to be of *divine* Right, and of the *laſt* Concern to the Church) to depend on the different Acceptation of a Word (*thou* or *you*) And there is not any Umbrage of its being taken in that Senſe, except in that one Place of the Epiſtle to *Thyatira*, for which I have accounted ſufficiently in the 4th *Query* of this *Chapter*.

Query VII. Whether it is reaſonable to ſay, That in all *Aſia*, even taken in that ſtrict Senſe, which Archbiſhop *Uſher* thinks it is to be taken in, in the New Teſtament, for the *Lydian* or *Proconſular-Aſia*, there were but Seven Pariſhes, or parochial Churches, in the modern Senſe of

a

a Pariſh? The Apoſtles laboured very much in that Part of the World, and the Chriſtian Faith prevailed very much there, it being expreſly ſaid, That *Chriſt was heard of*, and conſequently preached in all *Aſia*; and St. *Paul* had a great and effectual Door opened to him, which made him ſtay Three Years in thoſe Places, where certainly he was not idle; I think, that any unprejudic'd Perſon will be more apt to conclude, that the Seven Churches were rather Seven Dioceſian Pariſhes or Biſhopricks, it could not but afford Matter of Wonder, that the Apoſtles St. *John* and St. *Paul*, with many others, ſhould have beſtowed ſo many Years Labour there, and yet, that in thoſe Cities and Countries the Numbers of Chriſtians ſhould have been ſo very *few*, as the Presbyterians would make them; and yet, that in ſo ſhort a Time thereafter, there ſhould be ſuch vaſt Numbers of them in *Aſia*, I doubt if it be poſſible, to reconcile ſuch Inconſiſtencies.

CHAP. VIII.

Some farther *Queries* upon the Buſineſs in Hand.

Query I. HOW far any beſides Apoſtles, were concerned in the firſt Council in *Jeruſalem*, of which St. *Luke* gives

us

us Account, *Acts* 15? And whether Deacons did not baptize? And if it be granted, that they did and might *baptize*, but, that they could not *administer* the blessed Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, whether their voting in the first Council, (if they had Suffrages there) does not advance them to an *Equality* with *Presbyters*, as well as Presbyters voting there (if they did vote) raises them to an Equality with Bishops? But express Texts of Scripture is demanded for making appear, that either Deacons or mere Presbyters did vote in that Council. Now, that both Deacons and Presbyters did baptize in their Absence, and by the Allowance of the Bishop, is clear from that famous Place of *Tertullian*, *Dandi scilicet Lavacrum, quidem habet jus summus sacerdos, qui est Episcopus. Dehinc Presbyteri & Decani, non tamen sine Episcopi Auctoritate propter Ecclesiæ honorem, quo salvo salva pax est.* Englished, The Chief Priest, who is the Bishop, has the Power of Baptism; next to him the Presbyters and Deacons, but not without the Authority of the Bishop, for the Honour of the Church: By this Means the Honour of the Church is preserv'd, *Lib. de Baptismo, Cap.* 17. That Writer flourish'd about the Two hundred Year after the Incarnation of our Lord. But *Philip*, one of the seven Deacons, his baptizing the *Samaritans* and the Eunuch, *Acts* 8. is Proof from Scripture, that Deacons had Power to baptize.

Query II. What the *Ruling Elder* is? Whether a mere *Lay-man* or an *Ecclesiastick*; And, if he

he be no more than a *Lay man*, how he comes by a decisive Vote in Church Affairs? I would also gladly know the Characters of the other *Lay-Elders*, and if they owe not their Original, or rise to *John Calvin* after he had been banished *Geneva*, for the first Scheme of Government he had set up there; with which the Inhabitants of that Place were greatly dissatisfied; And for appeasing them, he invented these *Elders*, by which means, he gives the People a greater share in the Government of the Church, than he had formerly allowed them, to gain their Favour, *vide Calvinum de Tristibus*. I crave also expres's Texts of Scripture for Kirk-Sessions, Presbyteries, Synods, and General Assemblies, or Commissions of the General Assemblies, as they are now in use among the Presbyterians in *Scotland*.

Query III. Whether *Popery* and *Presbytery* do not join Issue against *Episcopacy*? There is no doubt of the opposition made to it by Presbytery; and whoever reads the History of the Council of *Trent*, written by the famous Father *Paul*. will find as little Reason to doubt of the *Pope's* and Court of *Rome's* opposition to it, in both Sessions of that tedious Council; besides, let them who doubt, consult the famous Speech of *Laynez*, the general of the *Jesuits*, a Partizan of the Court of *Rome*. *Concil. Trident. Lib.* 7. Where you'll find that long winded Discourse of his against the divine Right of *Episcopacy*: And the Writers in favours of the *Papacy* since that Time, particularly *Bellarmin, de Rom. Pont. Lib.* 4. Yea, if *Episcopacy* be allowed to be of divine Right, and that Bishops

have their Commiſſion from Chriſt, with Reſpect to Orders and Juriſdiction and not from the *Pope*; this quite ſubverts the *Pope*'s pretended and uſurp'd Headſhip over the Church; and *Epiſcopacy* is a better Barrier againſt *Popery*, than any other Form of Church Government that has at any Time obtained in the reformed Churches; and whatever Clamours have been either ignorantly or maliciouſly rais'd againſt *Epiſcopacy*, which has been aſpers'd by its Enemies as the Limb of *Antichriſt*, and the ſtirrup to *Papacy*; Yet I dare affirm that *Presbytery* has a much greater Affinity to *Popery* than *Epiſcopacy* has, and I am perſwaded, that any impartial, judicous Enquirer, after compariſon duely made, will own himſelf to be of my Opinion.

Query IV. Whether it was want of Opportunity, and the Circumſtances of the Reformers, or any ſettled Principle againſt *Epiſcopacy* as an unlawful Government in the Church, that made any of the firſt Reformers, eſtabliſh any other Form of Government in the Churches, which they were Inſtrumental in reforming from the Errors and Corruptions of *Popery*? See *Calvin*'s *Inſtitutions* Lib. 4. Cap. 4. And, whether any of the reformed Churches, when they withdrew their Obedience, from the Biſhops, did not in their Apologies which they made for doing it, declare that neceſſity, and not choice obliged them to alter that beſt Form of Church Government by Biſhops, in Regard that the Biſhops then, would not diſclaim their Dependence on the

the *Pope*, nor disown the Erroneous Doctrines, and Superstitious, and Idolatrous Worship of the Church of *Rome*? And if they do not express their Wishes to have retain'd *Episcopacy*, as some other reform'd Churches did, as the most laudable and convenient Government of any? I ask also, Whether ever any reform'd Church in Christendom, except a Party in *Great Britain* and *Ireland* did declare against *Episcopacy*, as unlawful in it self, and *Antichristian*; or affirm that it was necessary or lawful to separate from a Church, merely because it was govern'd by *Bishops*.

Query V. Whether *Presbyterie's* being settled by Act of Parliament upon the Foundation of the *Inclinations of the People*, be not as home a Stroke at the *divine* Right of Presbytery, as the Acts of Parliament in Time of *Episcopacy*, by which *Cæsar* seem'd to take more than his Due in Church-affairs, and the Government of it, is to primitive Episcopacy, and the intrinsick Power of the Church? And whether the Episcopal Clergy, who in their Judgment thought, that those Acts of Parliament gave the King too much Power in Spirituals, were not as safe to act *salvo jure Ecclesiæ*, as the Presbyterian Clergy are now, considering the afore-mentioned Act, settling Presbytery? Or, whether the Episcopal Clergy were more *Erastian*, who would not take the *Test*, without an authorized Explanation of it by the King and his Council, by which the intrinsick Power of the Church is reserved

ſerved entire to it, as it was practis'd in the firſt Three Centuries, or, the Presbyterians at this Day, who, when it was propoſed in the laſt Seſſion of Parliament, that the Church ſhould be declared independent of the King and Government, and their *intrinſick* Power exerciſed by themſelves, as they ſhould ſee Occaſion, and yet ſlighted it? Their Friends in the Parliament oppoſed and voted againſt their having this Power, and the Committee of the General Aſſembly rejected the Overture which was made, in Favours of the Power and Rights of the Church? Alſo, Whether, ſuppoſing that the *Inclinations of the People*, which, by the Experience of all Ages, have been found to be very inconſtant, ſhould alter, ſo as to declare Presbytery a Grievance, and deſire a new Form of Church Government; and at laſt get it ſet up by the Civil Authority; would not any ſuch new *Model* ſtand on as good a Foundation, as Presbytery does at this Day?

F I N I S.

ERRATA in the Preface.

PAge 4. *l.* 21. for *in* Place, read *place in.*
P. 6. *l.* 9. after Power, add *practis'd.*

ERRATA in the Queries.

PAge 7. *l.* 19. for *preach'd*, read *practis'd.*
P. 33. *l.* 24. for *as the greater*, read *as to the greater.*